

OUR TRANSLATED GOSPELS

By the Same Author

*

THE FOUR GOSPELS
A New Translation

*

OUR TRANSLATED GOSPELS

SOME OF THE EVIDENCE

By

CHARLES CUTLER TORREY
*Professor of Semitic Languages in
Yale University*

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LIMITED LONDON

ST. PAUL'S HOUSE

WARWICK SQUARE

E. C.

4

TO

ANNE NOBLE TORREY



Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	ix
INTRODUCTION	xv
§1. The Messianic Expectation	
§2. The Program of Second Isaiah	
§3. The Task of the Nazarenes	
§4. The Literary Propaganda of the First Decade	
§5. The Solidarity of the Gospel Tradition	
§6. "Biblical Greek"	
CHAPTER I. AMBIGUITY OF THE ARAMAIC TEXT	I
Exhibit I. Mk. 3:5, 4:4, 4:8, 4:12	
Exhibit II. Mk. 9:15, 9:49, 9:50, 10:6, 14:38	
Exhibit III. Mk. 14:68, Mt. 5:32, 6:6, 6:18, 19:17	
Exhibit IV. Mt. 21:9, 21:43, 23:38, 26:70, 27:62, 28:1	
Exhibit V. Mt. 28:17, Lk. 1:66, 2:11, 8:14, 8:29	
Exhibit VI. Lk. 9:25, 9:51, 11:33, 11:36, 12:49, 19:42	
Exhibit VII. Lk. 21:25, 22:60, 23:54, 24:9 ff.	
Exhibit VIII. Jn. 5:36, 5:44, 11:33, 38, 12:11, 15:16	
Exhibit IX. Jn. 12:34, 13:11 f., 14:7 f.	
Exhibit X. Jn. 14:28b, 14:17, 19, 16:5, 16:30, 19:35	
CHAPTER II. QUESTIONS UNDERSTOOD AS DECLARATIONS	54
Exhibit XI. Mk. 9:12, 14:41 f., Lk. 16:8 f.	
Exhibit XII. Jn. 6:32, 7:28, 12:7, 11:49 f.	
CHAPTER III. THE REDUNDANT "AND"	64
Exhibit XIII. Mk. 16:2-4, Mt. 3:16, Lk. 7:12, 13:25, Jn. 1:19 f., 20:17, Lk. 2:21, 2:27 f.	
CHAPTER IV. THE REFLEXIVE PRONOUN AND ITS SUBSTITUTE	74
Exhibit XIV. Lk. 9:25, Jn. 13:32, Mk. 6:31, Mt. 23:9, Lk. 7:30, 18:11, Jn. 11:33, 20:10	
CHAPTER V. LUKE AND THE PALESTINIAN DIALECT	82
Exhibit XV. Lk. 1:39, 8:39, 2:1, 6:40, 8:27, 9:10, 17:22	

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VI. WRONG VOCALIZATION OF THE ARAMAIC	91
Exhibit XVI. Mk. 7:3, 10:12, 14:3, Mt. 5:48, 8:9, 10:2	
Exhibit XVII. Mk. 6:14, Lk. 7:45, 7:47, 10:14, 11:41, 11:48	
Exhibit XVIII. Lk. 13:32, 16:16, 24:32, Jn. 6:21	
Exhibit XIX. Jn. 7:37 f., 10:7 f., 14:2, 17:14	
CHAPTER VII. CONFUSION OF נִיָּן AND נִיָּן	115
Exhibit XX. Mk. 5:21 f., Jn. 1:15, 1:18, 14:22, 18:25	
CHAPTER VIII. SLIGHT CORRUPTION OF THE ARAMAIC TEXT	121
Exhibit XXI. Mk. 9:29, 15:21, Lk. 13:32 f., 21:5	
Exhibit XXII. Lk. 19:20, 24:17, Jn. 5:34, 7:8, 14:31	
CHAPTER IX. <i>Aleph</i> INSERTED OR OMITTED	141
Exhibit XXIII. Mk. 6:8 f., Jn. 3:33, 5:44, 5:27, 8:56, 11:2	
CHAPTER X. <i>Waw</i> OR <i>Yodh</i> INSERTED OR OMITTED	150
Exhibit XXIV. Mk. 10:32, Jn. 1:12 f., Mt. 2:23	
Exhibit XXV. Mk. 6:20, Mt. 24:51, Jn. 7:3	
CHAPTER XI. LOST PORTIONS OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT	159
GENERAL INDEX	163
INDEX OF PASSAGES	165

PREFACE

THE material of our Four Gospels is all Palestinian, and the language in which it was originally written is Aramaic, then the principal language of the land; with the exception of the first two chapters of Lk., which were composed in Hebrew. Each of the first two Gospels, Mk. and Mt., was rendered into Greek very soon after it was put forth. The Gospel of Jn. was translated considerably later, probably at Ephesus. (The translator added, in Grk., chap. 21.) Lk. made in Palestine, very likely during the two years of Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea (Acts 24:27), a collection of Semitic documents relating to the life and work of Jesus, arranged them very skilfully, and then rendered the whole into the Grk. which is our Third Gospel.

The proof of these facts is multiform, and of very large amount. The present volume can give merely "some of the evidence," in fact only that small but very important part which can be seen and understood by the layman who knows neither Greek nor any Semitic language. The main purpose is to present the most striking examples of *mis-translation* in our Grk.; for these, when they can be demonstrated, are of the greatest significance. The critical notes appended to my translation, *The Four Gospels* (Harpers, 1933), had in large part this same purpose, but were much too brief and obscure, not showing clearly the form of the supposed error; also, in some of the most important passages, they were made useless to the ordinary reader by referring to discussions in publications generally inaccessible to him.

In the present volume the material is classified so as to bring together in successive chapters the cases illustrating various typical errors (such as are everywhere present in the Grk. O.T.), with the result of gaining a cumulative effect. The evidence is presented as far as practicable in a form appealing to the eye. For this purpose Semitic characters are used in the successive "exhibits" only to the extent of showing in each case the mistranslated word or words, while a translation gives in large type both the false and the true rendering.

Explanatory notes, made as untechnical as possible, accompany the passages considered. The reader is thus provided with a brief commentary on about 140 of the readings in the Four Gospels which have been the most difficult of interpretation. As he sees clearness brought out of obscurity and sense substituted for nonsense, and this only with the strictly conventional method universally recognized and necessary in the criticism of any ancient and frequently copied work, he can form his own idea as to the probable origin of our received text.

The Gospels as completed and published, in their present extent and form, are all of considerably earlier date than has commonly been supposed. The latest of them can be only a little later than the middle of the century. At the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in New York City, in December, 1934, I challenged my New Testament colleagues to designate even *one* passage, from any of the Four Gospels, giving clear evidence of a date later than 50 A.D., or of origin outside Palestine. The challenge was not met, nor will it be, for there is no such passage.

The conclusion, from the evidence presented in this volume, that the Grk. of our Gospels is the result of translation, is inescapable. If, for instance, the Gospel of Jn. (in which the proof of *mistranslation* is even more striking than in the other Gospels) is not here shown to have been composed and published in the Aramaic language, then it is only fair to say that there is no such thing as proving translation from internal evidence. But every scholar knows that such proof is rendered with certainty in countless cases. How? By the method, precisely, which is used here; there is no other. Numerous translations from Semitic into Greek, in the complete absence of even a word of the original text, have been demonstrated and accepted as such in recent years; generally after the writings had been pronounced "unquestionably Greek" by generations of excellent scholars. In no such case has evidence been presented even remotely approaching that which is afforded by the Gospels. According to the standard deemed satisfactory in these instances, each of our Gospels is now shown, many times over, to be a close rendering from a Semitic original. Indeed, I think it would be difficult to find anywhere, in translation from any language, more perfect proof than is offered here.

The restoration of the original Semitic text in the very words employed by the evangelist, or (in the case of Lk.) by his sources, is ordinarily sure where the Grk. is plainly corrupt. But there is no claim of infallibility, conjectures must stand on their own merits, and occasionally it will be found necessary to correct or improve them. There are in this volume a few instances of such improvement over the verbal form conjectured in my *Four Gospels*, as well as

two or three cases not there recognized; see especially the notes on Mt. 5:32 and Jn. 5:34. Perhaps the most important revision of a former conjecture is in the verses Jn. 10:7 f.; see Exhibit XIX, B. Very possibly other cases of mistranslation will eventually be discovered, though their number will, I think, be very small.

We can generally be sure of our text, from the beginning of Mt. to the end of Jn. We encounter no such hopeless problems, at any point, as those which confront us constantly in the O.T. The corruption is a matter of single words, not of whole passages. The very few *lacunae* of which there is evidence can be filled with practical certainty; see Chapter XI. Otherwise in the O.T. When the Heb. text of I Sam. 13:1 tells us, with a straight face: "Saul was one year old when he began to reign, and he reigned two years in Jerusalem"; or when we read, in our best witness to the original Heb. of 2 Chron. 35:19 f. (namely 1 Esdr. 1:21 f.), the result of an obvious lacuna, that the story of pious King Josiah was written in the record "of the worst sinners and most impious of men,"¹ we have in the one case nothing whatever to guide us; in the other, it is only possible to make a precarious guess. The Gospels have suffered no recognizable loss. Mk. and Mt. were carefully copied, rendered with admirable faithfulness into Grk. almost immediately (for the reason which will be given), and thereafter the text was as ably watched over as was humanly possible. As soon as the Grk. Jn. appeared, the Four were combined in a Tetraevangelium, the "Gospel of the Several" (authors).

¹ Our Heb. avoids the libel by excising the whole passage; the LXX, both by omitting and by substituting a long passage from 2 Kings.

The following Introduction attempts to give some account of the conditions under which the Gospels were composed; throwing extremely important light on the Jewish Messianic doctrine of the time; showing also why the Gospels were written early, why in Aramaic, and why Mk. and Mt. were so promptly rendered into Grk. Some aspects of the critical problem are also considered.

The question is frequently asked: Why, if the Gospels are of such early date, do we not find them used in the Pauline writings? The answer is not difficult. Paul, as we see from his own words (Gal. 1:11 f., 16-19; 2:6) would have been the last man on earth to say, or to believe, or to give to others reason for believing, that he was indebted for his "gospel" to any human being, much less to any mere writings. These documents, moreover, were definitely intended for men who did *not* believe on the Nazarene. It is easy to see why Paul may have preferred to leave their use to others, while going his own way. He did not need them, and certainly could not be expected to quote from them.

Another very natural query concerns the total disappearance of this Aramaic literature, and again the reason for the fact is hardly obscure. Literature disappears very rapidly when it is no longer wanted. Only in disregard of history could any one be surprised at the loss of the far more voluminous extra-canonical Jewish literature in Heb. and Aram. belonging to the pre-Christian time. As for the Christian documents, we may imagine with what eagerness (see *Introd.*, §3, latter part) and thoroughness these arch-heretical and dangerous writings would have been destroyed, all

through the land, by the Jews, who had the authority and the might to do this. The Romans under Titus doubtless did more, like the Greeks in the Maccabean time (1 Macc. 1:56-58). And when the Christians cut loose from the Jews, they had no further use for the language of their enemies.

INTRODUCTION

§1. *The Messianic Expectation*

THE earliest Christian writings all aim to present the man of Nazareth as the divine leader, the Messiah, predicted in the Hebrew scriptures. As regards doctrine, the Four Gospels claim to represent the faith of Israel unchanged. Addressed, as without exception they all are, to the Jewish people familiar with the sacred writings, they hold fast to the word of God. Their rallying-cry is "fulfilment," and there they rest their case.

That which the Jews had been awaiting was by no means the restoration of the monarchy, as is often supposed. The essential meaning of "the restoration of Israel" was the final establishment of God's chosen people in its rightful position of spiritual leadership, a supremacy gladly acknowledged throughout the wide world, as pictured especially in Second Isaiah. The height of material prosperity, and universal authority, were of course included in the picture, but the political element was never prominent. The Jews were not such simple folk as to suppose that the eternal plan of the God of the whole earth could be realized by the re-establishment of the Hebrew state, with a Jewish king on the throne in Jerusalem.

In the days of the Hebrew monarchies, the conception of a restored "house of David" in fulfilment of 2 Sam. 7:16 might have satisfied; though the Hebrew people eventually had more than their fill of kings, whether of their own race or of the foreign nations. Even the most acceptable of

their legitimate rulers, men like Hezekiah and Josiah, were of relatively very little consequence. Long before the beginning of the present era the conception of the coming Deliverer as a mere human being had been completely abandoned. He had now become the "mighty god" of Is. 9:5 (see Gray's *Comm.*, p. 173!), the "prince of peace"; also destined "to smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips to slay the wicked" (11:4). Here the term "Son of God," for the Expected One, is definitely provided. The true Messianic doctrine made its appearance in the latter part of the Persian period, and it came into being full-fledged, or nearly so.

In *The Beginnings of Christianity*, by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, I, p. 356, we read: "It cannot be too strongly emphasized that there was no generally accepted opinion, no organised and consistent teaching, above all no orderly Messianic doctrine possessing the faintest shadow of authority." The opinion thus expressed is rather widely held at present; I think the fact will eventually be recognized that it is utterly mistaken. Had the Jews no interest in the Prophets? They would have been unlike every other thoughtful people on earth—unlike the eager theologians we know them to have been—if they had not possessed a very full and well-defined body of belief in regard to their divine protagonist and prince of peace, who was destined to save them and the world. It is, I think, no exaggeration to say, that the fundamental teachings in regard to the person of the Anointed One, and the program, fully developed, of his coming, his conquest, and his world-wide rule, were clearly seen and taken for granted by all the Jewish writers of the last centuries B.C.

The rhapsodies in Is. 9 and 11 do not at all sound like new announcements; they summon their hearers to exult in a well-known assurance of coming glory. Contrast the impressive "Behold my Servant!" of 42:1, or "I make thee henceforth to hear new things" of 48:6. Others beside the writer of chaps. 9 and 11 had given the Hebrew thinkers food for thought. I have elsewhere attempted to show that the passage in chap. 9 harks back to 66:7-9, 12, and 65:17, and to point out the evident fact that 11:6-8 is a literary expansion of 65:25 (as Gray, pp. 223 f. concludes). Verses 11:2-4a are plainly derived from 61:1-3, and 11:4b may well have been suggested by 49:2a, a striking phrase in one of the most thought-provoking utterances in all Hebrew prophecy. 11:2a repeats the words of 56:8a.²

The eloquent author of the passages in Is. 9 and 11, with their description of the divine-human leader and his everlasting rule, derived his inspiration from Second Isaiah, that is certain. It is a very significant fact that the most of the "Messianic" descriptions in Hebrew-Jewish literature, and of the N.T. allusions and appeals to such scripture as definite prediction of the superhuman being who now at last had appeared on earth, have in mind the same great prophecy. To list and discuss such references would require a long chapter. A few of the most striking passages are briefly presented in "The Influences," pp. 29-34; others will occur to any student of the Bible.

Especially important illustration is to be seen in Psalms 17 and 18 of the "Psalms of Solomon," in which the char-

² See *The Second Isaiah*, pp. 470 ff.; and "The Influence of Second Isaiah in the Gospels and Acts," *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, vol. 48 (1929), pp. 28 f., this essay referred to in the sequel as "The Influence." By "The Second Isaiah" I mean chaps. 34-66, with the omission of 36-39.

acter and work of the coming Messiah are described. These poems obviously present no new doctrine, but give expression to long-cherished and very definite beliefs. To quote from my "Outcroppings of the Jewish Messianic Hope," published in *Studies in Early Christianity*, edited by S. J. Case, N. Y. and London, 1928; referred to in the sequel as "Outcroppings": p. 289, "No one would ever be led . . . to suppose that the Messianic doctrine was new to the poet or to his readers. He is obviously dealing with long-familiar ideas and expressions. He has no need to explain anything, nor even to cite the older scriptures." In the Introduction to the edition by Ryle and James (*The Psalms of Solomon*, 1891), pp. lii-liv, the idea of the Messiah in these poems is set forth. *Every one* of the many items in this list—the features of the Messianic kingdom and the distinctive characteristics of the person himself—is to be found, *definitely and unmistakably*, in Second Isaiah.

The Anointed One of these psalms is a divine being. In the Introduction just mentioned, p. lv, the editors deny this; but their contention, I think, cannot stand. Israel had been definitely promised, in Is. 9 and 11, a *divine* deliverer and governor, a superhuman king on the throne of David, destined to reign forever, and to perform just such wonders as are described in these psalms. The abandonment of great promises for small, when the benefactor is known to be omnipotent, is unthinkable; the Jews had suffered no loss of faith (read the Psalter!); the achievements predicted are out of the range of human possibility; and finally, in 17:39, where the editors rightly recognize a *verbal citation of Is. 11:4*, the power wielded by this Anointed One is said to be "forever," *eis aiōva*! In these poems, then, as every-

where else, the Jewish Messiah is a divine-human person. It was not necessary to say this in so many words (as Ryle and James, on 18:6, would claim), for every Israelite had known it for centuries past.

In my "Outcroppings" I showed good reasons why the doctrine of a Jewish king, reviving the throne of Judah and trampling on the Gentiles, was not often paraded in writings intended for public circulation. Palestine in the last centuries B.C. was a powder magazine ready to explode, as both Jews and Gentiles thoroughly understood. Read Ezra 4:15, 19, and Jn. 11:48, and consider the lesson of the Maccabean uprising. "The Messianic hope was an underlying stratum rather than a field of thought open to the eyes of the world" ("Outcroppings," p. 285). It was also unnecessary to repeat what had already been given classical expression, and was firmly established in Hebrew theology.

Malachi, who wrote under a Persian governor, uses the terms "the Lord" and "the Messenger of the Covenant," 3:1 ff. (see Is. 42:19 and 44:26), and every reader knew what was meant. Daniel, in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, presents a pre-existent "man" coming in the clouds of heaven (7:13 f.), whose dominion will be everlasting; but when the historical interpretation is reached (vs. 27), he wisely omits repetition of what was already definite enough (see Exhibit XXIII, D). Henceforth "*the Man*" was a definite Messianic title, admirably cryptic, and useful wherever ambiguity was desirable. The fact of its wide familiarity is obvious from the Book of Enoch, chaps. 46-70 ("Son of Man"), the Four Gospels, and 1 Acts.⁸

⁸ By this title I mean to designate Acts 1:1-15:35, a Judean document of the early church, which I think I have sufficiently shown to have been originally

As a matter of course, the Messiah was conceived as a pre-existent being, by Yahweh held in readiness for the time when he should be incarnated in a man of David's line. No other conception was possible after Is. 9:5 f.(!), and no other was natural. The doctrine happens to be expressly stated in Enoch, 48:2, 3, 6 and elsewhere; in Ps. Sol. 18:6 ("the day . . . when he shall bring back his Anointed"); in 4 Ezra 12:32, 13:26, 52; and Jesus is made to claim it for himself in Jn. 8:58 and 17:5, 24. Dan. 7:13 has already been mentioned.

In Enoch 48, verses 2-6 show repeatedly and distinctly that they come from Is. 49:1, 2, 6. In the beginning of the world (cf. Jn. 1:1) "the name of the Son of Man was named"; he was chosen of God and "hidden before him." Cf. Is. 49:1 ff.: "Yahweh called me from the womb, in the bowels of my mother he named my name; he made my mouth like a keen sword, in the shadow of his hand he concealed me; he made me a sharpened arrow, in his quiver he hid me away." So also in 4 Ezra, chap. 13, "the Son of God" is "Kept for a long period of time" (vs. 26), hidden away, to be seen by no man on earth until "the time of his day"; cf. the "Hidden Imam" preserved in heaven, of certain Shi'ite Mohammedan sects.

The inevitable title "Son of God" (see Ps. 2:7) long antedated "Son of Man." It was prescribed in Is. 9:5, and thus came indirectly from 66:7 (see above). The two titles were of course interchangeable, as they are in the "Similitudes" of Enoch. The conception of a pre-existent divine spirit incarnated in a man of human parentage destined to reign

written in Aramaic, and translated into Greek by Luke (*Composition and Date of Acts*, 1916).

forever is indeed strange to modern ideas (see *The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 366), but to the Jews of that day, with their absolute faith in Yahweh's omnipotence, it could cause no difficulty whatever. It was in this very thing that all their hope lay. The "mighty god" on the throne of David, the eternal king of the Messianic age, is not expressly declared to be a scion of David in Is. 9, though this is plainly implied; in 11:1 it is said in so many words. In the verse 4 Ezra 12:32 the Coming One is *both* pre-existent and "of the seed of David," and the same conception is fundamental to the christology of the Psalms of Solomon. The doctrine of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel (in spite of the purely superficial term *Logos*, a mere up-to-date ornament borrowed from Greek philosophy) had been a commonplace of Jewish theology for three or four centuries. The documents, strangely neglected and misinterpreted, are before us, and their teaching is clear and consistent.

The promise to David always maintained its place in the great expectation. The editors of Ps. Sol., quoted above, saw a very long interval in which the prediction was either forgotten or disregarded (Introd., p. liv). According to their view, Haggai was the last to emphasize it, until it was resurrected, for some reason, by the author of these psalms! In particular, they find it significant that the house of David is left out of sight in the considerable literature of the Hasmonean period. As to this, there are two things to be said: (1) The Hasmoneans were not descendants of David, but of the priests, and therefore the prediction of triumph through a man of *his* line would hardly be dwelt upon in their time (though the cherished expectation is

stated definitely enough in 1 Macc. 2:57!); (2) The dating of Hebrew literature is less easy now than it was in 1891.

Even before the time when the true "Messianic" doctrine took shape it had ceased to be possible to tell who were the descendants of David, and who were not. Genealogical lists were easily constructed, but less easily credited. After the *divinity* of the Anointed One had been firmly and permanently established in Hebrew theology, the "Son of David" was thought of more and more as a title, even while the lineage was held to be necessary. Yahweh, who would appoint the time, would provide the person. He who from the stones of the field could raise up children to Abraham could renew the blood of David in any man of his choice. (Somewhat similarly, John the Baptist was Elijah; not the same who stood with Moses on the mount of transfiguration, but a prophet "in the spirit and power of Elijah," Lk. 1:17.) So it came about that such a saint and patriot as Rabbi Akiba could accept, whole-heartedly, Bar Cocheba as the promised Messiah, though no one believed him to be a son of David by human descent.

The editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* express surprise that the idea of a *warrior* king is so prominent in Ps. Sol.; and they are inclined to think that under the influence of "some Targums" Rabbi Akiba had been led to conceive of the Messiah as "a liberator" (p. 361). But the Messiah was *always* a liberator, *always* "a triumphant warrior"—in the initial stage of his glorious career. No portrayal, from the earliest time onward, is complete without this absolutely essential feature. The overthrow of the hostile nations was his first great task. Was Israel in no need of liberation? Were "the uttermost parts of the earth" to

be peaceably annexed? All the prophets and psalmists foretold that at the end of the present age there must be a mighty conflict, a tremendous clash between Yahweh's hosts and the world powers representing his enemies. The divine champion pictured in Is. 11:4b (the passage verbally cited in Ps. Sol. 17:39, and seemingly derived from Is. 49:2) is expressly appointed to accomplish this task of conquest and deliverance. There is no accident in the prediction, nor is its repetition in Ps. Sol. an isolated fact. On the contrary, it was the usual conception of the latest Hebrew writers that the pre-existent Son of God was destined to lead his Father's hosts in the day of triumph. Not that the marvelous power wielded by the Son is his own; it is always the might of Yahweh, who holds the right hand of his agent, a distinctly subordinate being. The Messiah of the Book of Enoch is essentially the same as in the Psalms of Solomon (though the title "King" is avoided). See chaps. 46; 48:8 f.; 52:6-9; 62; 69:27; 105:2. He wields the might given him by the Most High, is destined to universal dominion, and is appointed judge of all the world. Similarly in Second Isaiah the triumph is given to the Servant (42:6 f.), but Yahweh is the real victor (vs. 13). This is put concisely, in a bit of late Hebrew mythology, in Hab. 3:13a, at the close of a highly figurative description of the final destruction of the powers of evil on the earth:

Thou wentest forth for the rescue of thy people,
For rescue, *with thine Anointed*.⁴

Another aspect of the deliverer is shown in Zech. 9:9 f.,

⁴ As I showed in "The Prophecy of Habakkuk," in *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut* (New York, 1935), pp. 581 f., Hab. 3:12-14 (of course with emendation of the text) is based directly and in part verbally on Is. 41:15 f.

where the portrait of "the King"—like all the other portraits—goes back ultimately to Second Isaiah. It is on the other hand noticeable in the last chapters of this prophecy, with their repeated mention of the coming kingdom and the slaughter of the nations, that while "the glory of the house of David" (12:7) is emphasized, the occupant of the throne is Yahweh himself (14:9, 16 ff.); this picture, obviously, for reasons of caution.

In the songs of the Psalter, where the final triumph and rescue are naturally prominent ideas, we see frequently a picture like that in Habakkuk. Thus in 110:1-5:

Yahweh says to my Lord,
Sit thou at my right hand,
Till I make thine enemies thy footstool. . . .
Yahweh at thy right hand
Will strike down kings in the day of his wrath.

The interpretation attested by Mk. 12:35-37 is certainly the one intended by the author of the psalm. We have already seen (above) that "Lord" is a title of the Messiah used by Malachi.

Even more like the picture in Habakkuk is that in Ps. 2, where the nations and the kings of the earth set themselves "against Yahweh *and his Anointed*," who is promised the power to "break them with a rod of iron, dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel"; words repeated as uttered to the Messiah, the Son of David, in Ps. Sol., 17:26. In vss. 6-8 of this second psalm, the coming King, the Son of God, is also given the promise:

Ask of me, and I will give you the nations as your portion,
The uttermost parts of the earth as your possession;

a saying paraphrased from Is. 55:4 f., where the prophet represents Yahweh as making allusion to the promise to David, and then as saying to the coming King: "Behold, I make you⁵ . . . the leader and commander of the peoples; you shall call nations that you know not," etc.

There are in the Psalter numerous passages of this nature, certainly conceived as definitely Messianic, which are so casual or cryptic as to leave us in uncertainty, in our inability to follow the imagination of the writer. The Messianic doctrine was so ancient, so firmly established, with its various formulae and its evasive allusions so universally understood, that there was no need of elaboration or explanation. There is here no space for discussing further examples.

The "King" in the Psalter, if not Yahweh himself, is always either David or the Messiah; the view of Driver and of many other scholars. At the time when these hymns were first sung in the temple there was no king on the throne in Jerusalem, nor any prospect of a restored kingdom. See 1 Chron. 16:34, 41; 2 Chron. 5:13; 7:6; Ezra 3:11; from the middle of the third century B.C. We do not happen to have any clear evidence as to the time when the Psalter was translated into Greek. It is not easy to believe that this could have waited until after the second century B.C. If the Hebrew psalmists are permitted the vivid imagination of oriental poets, and fervent religious feeling, there is no room for supposing Maccabean psalms.

One outstanding feature of the Messianic expectation, *the hope for the Gentiles*, has not thus far been touched upon, and must now be briefly considered. The share of the na-

⁵ As I attempted to show in *The Second Isaiah*, the suffixed pronoun must originally have been second person; the direct address should begin in vs. 4, not in the following verse.

tions in the blessings of the Coming Age, the result of their conversion to the true faith, is dwelt upon in all the earliest Christian records. The words attributed to Jesus in Mt. 24:14, 28:19, and Lk. 24:47 declare the necessity of evangelizing all the foreign peoples; and in the last-named passage this is said to be the teaching of the Hebrew scriptures. Indeed, there is constant reference to O. T. prophecy. Jesus quotes Is. 56:7 in Mk. 11:17, and 56:8 in Jn. 10:16; both passages fortelling the ingathering of the nations. Lk. 2:32 (in the Hebrew document) cites as Messianic the striking phrase of Is. 42:6, repeated in 49:6, "Light of the Gentiles"; and Paul also quotes the passage in Acts 13:47. There was at no time any thought of a gospel for the Jews only. Paul's new light on the matter concerned procedure only, as he himself says in Rom. 11:25 ff. (quoting Is. 59:20 f.); and the need of the new procedure was seen at once, and acted upon, by all the leaders of the church. It could not have been long postponed.

The teaching as to the Gentiles is wide-hearted in all the Hebrew-Jewish Messianic literature, though the fact is frequently ignored, or denied. It is not uncommon to see the Jewish doctrine of the first century—or indeed, of the whole post-Maccabean time—stated as though it looked for the ultimate extinction of the foreign peoples. R. H. Charles, in his *Translation of Enoch*, commenting on a passage which seems to include foreigners in the general resurrection, remarks (p. 139, footnote): "The whole history of Jewish thought points in an opposite direction"(!); and in a note on 48:4 (which quotes Is. 42:6): "The Messiah will become the light of the Gentiles through his future coming and character being made known unto them"—the light which

a man sees as his house burns down. In fact, the Book of Enoch promises "salvation" to both Jews and Gentiles; see for example 50:2-4; 90:30. The Psalms of Solomon do the same; see 17:4 (quoting Is. 42:3 f.), 35 f. (!), 38b; and also, again like Enoch, declare that the Messiah will punish Jews and Gentiles alike; see 17:26, 47. The fateful line which is drawn is between the adherents of the true faith and the wicked, of whatever nation. The substance of the faith is given with sufficient clearness in Enoch 48:5: "All who dwell on earth will fall down and bow the knee before him (the Messiah) and will bless . . . the Lord of Spirits."

As in Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon, so in all the pre-Christian Jewish literature, the hope for the nations is clearly stated, as a matter of course needing no explanation or comment. It is unnecessary to quote passages. See, for illustration, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Levi, 4:4, 18:9; Judah, 22:2, 24:6; Zebulun, 9:8; Dan, 6:7; Asher, 7:3, 9:2, 10:5, 10. Also Sibylline Oracles III, 710-723, 767 f.

The Psalter, the great hymnal of the Jewish people, widely familiar for many generations before the beginning of the present era, is full of the universal promise, the voice of the multitude. See, as a few examples, 65:3; 67:4-6; 72:17; 76:10 ("all the humble of the earth"); 86:9; 145:14-21. The picture of the glorious future drawn by psalmists and prophets (Zech. 9:10, in a Messianic picture, is typical) is always religious rather than political. Up to the time when the Gospels were written, there was no Messianic hope which did not include the mission to the Gentiles and their conversion in multitude; it was an essential feature of the great program.

A very noticeable feature, in all this Messianic prediction,

is the constant reference to the great prophecy, Is. 34-66. Many examples have been given in the preceding pages, and others could be added. In the Gospels and 1 Acts, especially, at the very points where authentication of the Messiahship is chiefly sought and needed, this particular scripture is in the foreground. In the narrative of the baptism, the voice from heaven declares Jesus not only the Son, but also the Servant; the phrase, "my beloved, in whom I delight," being taken from Is. 42:1. Again, at the transfiguration, the voice is heard, and this time Lk. (9:35) instead of "beloved" has the more exact rendering, "the Elect One" (a favorite title in the Book of Enoch). The added words, "Hear ye him," seem reminiscent of Is. 50:10, "Who is there among you who fears Yahweh? Hear⁶ the voice of his Servant!"

When the direct question is put to Jesus (Mt. 11:5, Lk. 7:22), "Are you the One predicted?" the answer is from Is. 61:1 ff. That is, the personage "anointed of Yahweh" (vs. 1) was by the Jewish people of that day understood to be the promised Son of David. This appears even more clearly, if possible, in Lk. 4:17-21, where Jesus says to the men of Nazareth, "Today the scripture which you have just heard is fulfilled!" The conclusion carries with it Is. 42:2 f., 7 and 49:8 f., for it is quite beyond question that in these passages the same coming Benefactor is described. In Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30 Jesus is identified with the Servant, and especially with the *suffering* Servant. Peter says to the people (3:26) that the great work is to be effective "in turning away every one of you from your sins." This refers directly

⁶ Pointing the verb as imperative, as it was actually read by the LXX, decidedly improves the passage.

to Is. 50 and 53; and the latter chapter is quoted to the same effect in Acts 8:32. "The Just One" of Acts 3:14 and 7:52 is a title derived from Is. 53:11. The "new covenant," to which Jesus refers in Mk. 14:24 and parallels, goes back through Zech. 9:11 (in the Messianic passage) to Is. 55:3 ff., repeated in 61:8 f. It is the new covenant with the Son of David, announcing that through the sacrifice of the Servant *the whole world*—not simply Israel—is to be saved.

Certain it is, that all the Hebrew-Jewish writers who deal with specifically Messianic doctrine, from the Gospels, 1 Acts, and Paul back through the post-canonical literature, the Psalter, the Prophets (Zech. 9:9, Hab. 3:13, Mal. 1:11; 3:1, Jer. 23:5, etc.), to Is., chaps. 9 and 11, look to Second Isaiah as the fountain head. The fact is more significant, I believe, than has been suspected. There was a definite time when a new picture of the future was drawn for Israel, a mighty portrayal which profoundly influenced all the subsequent literature, and was accepted by the people. Its central feature is the triumph and beneficent reign of *a superhuman king*, whose kindly authority is to be world-wide. Here for the first time the national hope was given a definite religious content, universal application, and enduring literary form. By the beginning of the first century of the common era the tradition of this new revelation was centuries old, but not too old to have been well preserved.

§2. *The Program of Second Isaiah*

The outstanding literary feature of this great masterpiece of religious philosophy is a figure of speech, well known, but not always well understood. The profound conception of the "Servant" as *the index of the nation* is worthy of this

greatest of the Hebrew prophets. It is the key to the understanding of the whole prophecy, underlying each of the successive features of a fully developed plan. The prophet sees human history as a unit, from the creation of the world to the day of the Messiah, and the center is Palestine. His thought is always primarily of his people; but Israel's *representative* (whether past or future) is always kept in sight, and the traits of the one are those of the other. His conception requires the use of the term "servant" in more than one connotation, and the differing applications of the figure must shade off into one another.⁷ Even where the person of the Davidic King (his great creation) is most distinctly portrayed, the picture soon returns—and must return—to the nation. The individual, the Coming One, stands clearly before us in 42:1 ff., in 45:1 ff., in 49:1-6, in 55:3-5, and in 61:1 ff.; but the picture dissolves.

In 41:8 ff., 14-16 the representative is named Jacob; he who at length will "shatter mountains, make hills as chaff"; the passage elaborated by Habakkuk in his picture of the Messianic triumph. In the same chapter we are given sudden glimpses of another champion, 41:2 f., 25; this time not named, though we can recognize him with certainty. It is (as the Targum recognizes) an idealized Abraham, the king who fought and conquered the great kings of the earth, projected from Gen. 14 into the dawn of the Messianic age. No other champion ever came "from the east" (Ur of the Chaldees) and "from the north" (Harran), "*calling on Yahweh's name*." He appears again in 46:11. But these patriarchs are only shadows of a far greater figure.

⁷I have set this forth with some fulness in *The Second Isaiah*, in the chapter dealing with Servant and the Messiah.

On the other hand, the mighty warrior (41:2 f., 45:1 ff.), the teacher (50:4), the Davidic king (55:3 ff.), the universal benefactor (61:1-3), is in each case and in a very true sense Israel personified, the embodiment of the nation at its best. Here the prophet saw more deeply than any of his predecessors. The meekness of the ruler, pictured in 42:2, is the counterpart of what is said of the nation in 50:4-9. The shattering, all-conquering might of Israel led by Yahweh (41:15 f.) is that of the Anointed One, similarly led, in 45:1 f. There is gain of hidden riches (45:3) or division of the spoil with the strong (53:12). "I call thee by name" (a highly significant phrase!) is said to one representative of the nation (Jacob) in 43:1, to another (the coming King) in 45:3 f., and again to the same personage (the Servant, not yet manifested) in 49:1.

Nevertheless, the nation is *not* identical with its pre-determined divine-human leader, and in two passages the prophet puts aside his characteristic symbolization to the extent of making a clear distinction. The title which is applied expressly, and in very significant language, to *the people Israel* in 41:8, 43:10; 44:1 f., 21; and even in 49:3, is employed in 49:5 f. to designate him who is ordained of Yahweh "*to bring back to him Jacob, and to gather for him Israel*." And in 45:4 f. the same mighty personage is called, and given his new "surname," *Anointed*; "*for the sake of Jacob my servant, and Israel my chosen*."

Here, as might have been expected, is the origin of the standing title "Messiah" applied to the central figure of the Hebrew national hope; it is given to him again in 61:1. Moreover, in the poems of this writer (who wrote, according to good evidence, at about the year 400 B.C.) there was

set before the eyes of Israel a picture of the King, and of the dawn of his day, which remained essentially the same for all the future time. Yet the prophet's new application of the term, and the signification of his whole prophecy were taken away from him (for modern readers) after having been in circulation for a century and a half. This magnificent creation, the Magna Charta of the world's redemption, a perfect literary unit from chap. 34 to chap. 66 (omitting, of course, chaps. 36-39), is reduced to incomprehensible fragments by the *absurd* interpolation of Cyrus in 44:28 and 45:1, accompanied by a few supporting insertions.⁸ It is strange that this very obvious work of editing, which has wrought unexampled mischief in the O.T. and still more in the Gospels, should be generally unrecognized at this present day, when so many similar interpretative insertions in Hebrew prophecy are well known. The reason for the interpolations in Second Isaiah is obvious and fully sufficient, namely, keen interest in the Chronicler's narrative contained in the book of Ezra.

The prophet's program for Israel is clear and consistent throughout. *First*, recognition of the present unworthiness. There can be no triumph, no kingdom as yet, for the people are not ready. Second Isaiah is emphatic on this point. Israel neither knows God nor comprehends his purpose (40:27 f.). "Thou hast not called upon me, Jacob, thou hast been weary of me, Israel. . . . Thou hast burdened me with thy sins, wearied me with thine iniquities" (43:22 ff.). "It is not in truth, nor by right, that they . . . stay themselves upon the

⁸ These excrescences were demonstrated as such in *The Second Isaiah*, chapter III.

God of Israel" (48:1 f.). "Thou heardest not, thou knewest not; from of old thine ear was not opened" (48:8). See also 50:1 f., 11, and the more definite accusations in chaps. 57 ff. and 65 f. As the prophet continues with his splendid predictions, he feels more and more strongly, and sets forth more and more sharply, the distressing outlook in his own day.

A corresponding contrast appears, of necessity, in the picture of the Leader who is held in waiting. In 42:1 ff. he is a most impressive figure, the ruler and judge of the world, seen in the indefinite future; in vss. 19 f. we are brought back to the present: "Who is *blind*, but my Servant? or *deaf*, as my Messenger⁹ whom I send? The people are discouraged, 40:27; 50:1; 58:3; 64:7, etc.; the future "restorer of Israel" cries (49:4): "I have labored for nought!" and he is shown how much he has to learn. In chap. 45, just after the promise of future triumph over every world power, Yahweh says to his Messiah (vs. 4): "I have called thee by thy name; I have surnamed thee [by the title "Anointed"], *though thou hast not known me.*"

Second, there must be suffering, and the reason for it must be understood. It is an essential feature of the divine plan; chaps. 50 and 53. Vicarious atonement is taught here as plainly as any words could teach it, and the fact was recognized by all in that day and in the following generations. It is the people of Israel who suffer, but the portrayal is in terms of their representative. It was open to any interpreter to see even the *death* of the sacrificial victim declared, and this in fact became the customary interpreta-

⁹ From this passage, and from 44:26, Mal. 3:1 derived the title "Messenger of the Covenant," employed of the Messiah (see above).

tion,¹⁰ though it was not the meaning intended by the prophet. When the Servant shall have completed his sacrifice, shall have "poured out his life to the utmost" (lit. "unto death"), vs. 12, this will mean that the saints and thinkers of Israel have accepted for themselves the great sacrifice.

Third, the nation must be spiritually prepared for its liberation and its triumph. Yahweh is ready at all times, and the day will come whenever Israel is fit for it: 42:23-25; 44:22; 48:18; 55:2 f., 6 f.; 58:1-11; 59:1 f. God keeps the liberator, the "sharp arrow," concealed in his quiver (49:2); when the time is ripe (Hab. 2:3) he will bring him forth. But the time of his manifestation depends on the people; it is only when they shall be *ready* (Lk. 1:17) that he can appear in the flesh. Not till then can be heard the roar of triumph in the city and the temple, announcing the birth of the "male child" (66:6 f.). It was the recognition of this necessity, and of the difficulty of meeting it, that produced the doctrine of the Forerunner, stated in Mal. 3:23 f. (4:5 f.).

Fourth, the people must spread abroad the true faith, not keep it to themselves. The Israelites always knew the need of propaganda, and felt its importance more and more as time went on. Second Isaiah gives them a new conception of the task. The faith of Israel (though not the special privilege of the chosen people) is for all mankind, and must be carried forth into every part of the world. The

¹⁰ Hence the doctrine, surviving in the Rabbinic writings, of the other Messiah, not the son of David but the son of Ephraim, who suffered and died. It is interesting to conjecture how a Targum of Is. 53 would have looked in the earlier part of the first century. The present Targum is a curious and ingeniously twisted specimen of exegesis, designed to remove completely from sight the interpretation accepted by the Christians, who had made great capital of the chapter.

Servant is given "a tongue for teaching" (50:4); the people must proclaim what they know. "You have heard all this, *will you not declare it?*" (48:6). They are Yahweh's witnesses, but have not witnessed. In 48:20 the prophet reminds them of the great deliverance, the flight from Egypt (not from "Babylon" and "Chaldea," which are interpolated), and proceeds: "Tell this, make it known; carry it forth to the end of the earth!" Cf. 52:10-12.

Fifth, multitudes of the Gentiles will see the truth and be persuaded, but these multitudes will be but a part of the whole; there must be a final conflict, in which Yahweh's might will be shown, and the powerful enemies of his people will be annihilated. So the prophets taught, and continued to teach. II Is. several times predicts this victory, in picturesque language; the passages have already been cited. In this conflict, in which "mountains are shattered and hills leveled" (41:15 f.; 42:13-15; 45:2a; Hab. 3:6, 9, 13 f. as emended), it is no human power that is wielded, no Israelite forces are in the field; Yahweh's "arm" is manifested (40:10; 51:9; 52:10; 53:1), and it is this which strikes down kings and armies in behalf of his Servant, called Jacob in 41:8-16, Abraham in vs. 25, and the Anointed in 45:1, who stands at his right hand (41:13; 45:1), as in Hab. 3:13.

The Second Isaiah's prediction of the ingathering of the Gentiles is his greatest contribution to the religious faith of Israel; greater even than his wonderful portrayal of the coming leader. He himself declares it to be a new revelation, never before made known. This he says in 48:6 f. (cf. 49:5 ff., 55:3-5), and then in 49:8-13 he proceeds to develop the theme. It was doctrine that could easily be misunder-

stood, and even resisted. He had prepared the way for it in the earlier chapters, from chap. 34 onward: contrasting the punishment of Yahweh's enemies with the future glory of Israel; proclaiming Yahweh as the creator of the universe and of *all* men on earth (this always introduced whenever the hope for the nations is mentioned); ridiculing the "gods" of the foreigners, naming especially Bel and Nebo, and predicting the downfall of that power (Babylon) whose yoke the Jews had been bearing. More than this, he expressly anticipates objection, disappointment, and replies to it, putting the words in Yahweh's mouth: "Will you question *me* about *my children*? will you command me concerning the work of my hands?" (45:11); and when, after the description of the home-coming of *the Gentiles* in 49: 8-13, Zion cries out, "Yahweh has forsaken me!" he replies, "Can a woman forget her child?" and in the remainder of the chapter sets forth the glory which no other people can share. It is significant that in chap. 45, before the passage just cited and leading the way to it, the prophet puts his creation of a *superhuman* son of David into necessary connection with his doctrine of the salvation of the Gentiles. See vss. 4-6, cf. 22 f. And indeed, as has already been said, the teaching concerning the Messiah, all the way from II Is. to the Gospels, always included as an essential feature the ingathering of the best of the nations.

Sixth, A new earth; endless reign of justice and good will among men; with the Messiah on the throne in a new Jerusalem, joyfully acknowledged by the erstwhile strangers and enemies (including kings), who make pilgrimages to the holy city, and are free to worship Yahweh in their own way. The wicked, of both Jews and Gentiles, have perished.

§3. *The Task of the Nazarenes*

What has here been set forth as "the program of Second Isaiah" was normative for all the subsequent Hebrew-Jewish writers, up to the rise of Christianity. Nothing was subtracted from it, certainly very little could be added to it. Every feature of the eschatology of the Gospels is derived from the O.T. The disciples of Jesus, when he had passed from among them, realized that no time must be lost, for there was much preparatory work to be done before the promised kingdom could be established on earth.

First of all, the person of the Nazarene must be equated with the long-inherited picture of the Messiah. The Jewish people, "beginning at Jerusalem," must be brought to accept the identification. Then, as soon as possible, the truth must be carried abroad to all the Jews of the Dispersion, for only through Jewish agency could the good tidings be proclaimed to the Gentiles.

In spite of the fierce and stubborn opposition already encountered, they can have had no doubt as to the outcome, for they were sure of their ground, and saw themselves in possession of important advantages. They numbered, from the first, a very considerable body of those who were fully persuaded that Jesus was the predicted Messiah. A powerful appeal could be made to his known personal character, and to his teachings that were preserved. There were eye-witnesses who would testify. Immensely important was the argument from *fulfilment of scripture*; for all the people, high and low, saw in the Hebrew scriptures the word of God, and believed that all must be fulfilled. And again,

there was the political situation, showing that the time was ripe for the promised deliverer.

They had no need, nor could they have wished, to revise the Messianic doctrine. It was very ancient, and known to all; their hope lay in maintaining and applying it. It was definite, detailed, and unquestioned. Frequently in the Gospels the claims of Jesus are tested by the popular beliefs: Could the Messiah come from Galilee? etc. Mt. 2:4 ff. represents the chief priests and scribes as furnishing Herod with the official Jewish teaching as to the birthplace of the expected king. The people know that his reign is to be eternal (Jn. 12:34). According to Mk. 14:61, Mt. 26:63, Lk. 22:70, the high priest and his associates held the Messiah to be the Son of God. It would have been folly on the part of these first Christian narrators to misrepresent what was well known. As for the passages of Hebrew scripture to which they especially appeal as Messianic, and as fulfilled in the man of Nazareth, it is altogether probable that in each case the interpretation which they give is the one which was accepted in their day. But the Messianic application of such passages was thenceforward repudiated, as a matter of course, by the Jewish authorities, as far as this could be done.

Nowhere in the Gospels, the Acts, and the writings of Paul is there the slightest evidence that any element of the Jewish people rejected the Messianic doctrine, or held it lightly. There is nowhere any hint of a contrast between those who held the doctrine and those who did not; and this means, beyond question, that there was no such line that could be drawn. The argument of the Nazarenes is always concerning *the person*, never concerning the office.

As for the Sadducees, it was natural that they, as a party, should show antagonism to the Nazarenes and their leaders (Mk. 12:18, Acts 4:1 f., 23:6 ff., etc.), because of the emphasis which the new teaching gave to the resurrection from the dead. This gives no evidence, however, that they rejected the ancient and deep-rooted faith of their people in the coming Son of David; for belief in the resurrection was not one of its essential features, nor was it inconsonant with any of their known tenets. Liberal and "modern" as they were, they certainly never abandoned, as a party, their claim to belong to God's chosen people.

Concerning the measure of success which the Nazarenes achieved in their initial task of persuading their fellow countrymen in Jerusalem, Judea, and Palestine we are very ill informed. The general impression of progress given in I Acts is doubtless trustworthy as far as it goes, but it leaves us in the dark as to many important matters.

Some highly significant evidence from the side of the unbelieving Jewish authorities is to be had, but very slight attention has been paid to it hitherto. It was presented in summary, apparently for the first time, by the late Professor George F. Moore in an article dealing with "The Repudiation of the Christian Scriptures" (by the Jews), published in *Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects*, a Testimonial to Charles A. Briggs; New York, 1911. The editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* recognize fully the importance of this article, and call attention to it in Vol. I, pp. 318-320, giving considerable excerpts, of which the following are the chief.

"In the early stages of the controversy as to the 'Writings' [especially Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Esther and Sirach]

'the Gospels' were expressly excluded, and by implication must previously have been sometimes admitted. This is clearly stated in Tosephta Yadaim ii, 13 and Tosephta Sabbath xiii (xiv), 5, in deciding which books may be rescued from fire on the sabbath; the Gospels are excluded, though they contain the name of God." . . . "The earliest mention is in the time of Johanan ben Zakkai; perhaps earlier than the war under Titus, not possibly more than a decade or two later."

This indicates the beginning of a stricter practice following a time in which Nazarenes, with their "gospels," were regarded as good and loyal Jews (though mistaken), and could share, like any others, in the synagogue service. New developments necessitated a change from this attitude of toleration.

"Johanan's successor, Gamaliel II, caused the petition for the downfall of the heretics to be inserted in the prescribed form of prayer" (the Shemone Esre; this was about the year 80).

"In the second and third decades of the second century the situation becomes more strained; all the great leaders of Judaism—Ishmael, Akiba, Tarphon, Jose the Galilean— inveigh against the heretics and their scriptures with a violence which shows how serious the evil was" (and numerous examples are given).

This supports perfectly the representation of I Acts, that the number of Jewish Christians became very large, enough so to cause much uneasiness. However, the firm opposition of the authorities, and of the great majority of the people, was decisive. "In the second half of the century the polemic against Christianity abruptly ceases." By this time the ma-

jority of the Jewish Christians had finally abandoned Judaism and thrown in their lot with the Gentiles.¹¹

The editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* comment: "The extreme importance of this evidence is twofold. First, it can scarcely refer to Greek books. It is therefore the earliest and most direct evidence that we possess for the existence of Aramaic (or, conceivably, Hebrew) gospels." . . . "Secondly, this . . . is probably the earliest evidence for 'gospels' in any form."

§4. *The Literary Propaganda of the First Decade*

The material of the Four Gospels is *Messianic* throughout. It is addressed to men who hold firmly a uniformly understood doctrine of the predicted saviour, saying to them in effect: Here is presented to you the wonderful news that the prophecies—which you well know—are at last being fulfilled; the incarnation of the "Servant" has already taken place; he has suffered and died, according to the prediction, and has returned, for a season, to heaven. The end of the present age is at hand, and the Kingdom of God on a new earth is soon to be established, as our forefathers, the inspired prophets, foretold. The story of the god-man and of his forerunner John the Baptist, with the proofs in detail, are here before you.

The most striking feature of this extensive material is its perfect homogeneity. It presents only the evidence of Jesus' Messiahship, nothing else. Moreover, it leaves entirely out of account, for the present, one highly important feature of the Messianic expectation, the light promised to the Gen-

¹¹ See also the interesting article by R. Travis Herford, "The Problem of the 'Minim' Further Considered," in *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut*, pp. 359-369.

tiles. The message now presented is for the chosen people, the heirs of Israel's past who know the doctrine of the Anointed, the people who are most in need of deliverance. Except in the reported last words of Jesus, and in one or two incidental allusions (Lk. 2:32, Jn. 11:52) there is no mention, nor account taken, of any who do *not* know the teaching regarding the Messiah of the Jews. It is hard to believe, in view of the large amount of this material, and of the variety in its literary form, that this uniformity can have been purely accidental. It suggests rather a clearly understood plan, and an overseeing authority.

The narratives, hymns, and discourses which make up the substance of our Gospels all give plain evidence of coming from about the same time, namely the earliest period of the "Christian" organization. There is no considerable change in the general impression of surrounding conditions from Mk. to Jn., nor any development of doctrine that would require more than a very short time. There is in the Fourth Gospel more of the atmosphere of controversy, due in part to the nature of the teachings put forth, but more to the fact of increasing opposition. Even here the "church" is still distinctly a Jewish sect, with no immediate prospect of breaking away from the Israelite community. "Salvation is of the Jews" (4:22). It seems hardly conceivable that the passage 12:20 ff. can have been written after Paul's missionary work had begun; indorsed, as it was, by the leaders in Jerusalem. The stage of "evangelization" which this Gospel represents (e.g. in 4:35-38) is the earliest, the purely Jewish stage. It contains, moreover, no "Christian" theology whatever, in distinction from Jewish doctrine.

What has here been said in regard to homogeneity applies

also, and equally, to the matter peculiar to the Fourth Gospel; but particularly considered is the widely circulated material used by the three Synoptists and in part by Jn.; and this, as has been remarked (and as many have said) is, all of it, of a clearly marked character which is significant. While incorporating folklore and popular tradition, it gives neither the one nor the other in primitive form, but only as re-shaped according to a comprehensive scheme.

We possess in the Gospels no picture of Jesus the man of Nazareth and Galilee, but only the picture of Jesus the Messiah of Hebrew prophecy and Jewish faith. Nowhere in the narrative material can be seen the purpose of a writer to exhibit, even momentarily, the purely human side of a divine-human life. We find no simply chronicled recollection of this or that event recorded solely for characterizing the person of a man among men. If at any point the narrator portrays what appears to be the weakness or limitation of a man constituted like his fellows, the real purpose of the picture is to show superhuman power, or the fulfilment of scripture, or both. The subordination of the Servant, the Anointed, the Holy One, the Son, to the Father is made very clear in the Hebrew scriptures, and it is in accordance with this teaching that we read: "to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give" (Mt. 20:23); "of that day or hour no one knows, . . . not even the Son" (Mk. 13:32); "the Son can do nothing of himself" (Jn. 5:19), etc.

All this means, that a definite pattern was followed, and that accordingly there were adopted only those reports and recollections which helped to form the picture believed to be true. It will of course be possible, to a very considerable extent, to separate the history from the interpretation;

though hardly by the quasi-scientific¹² approach known as "form criticism."

There can be no question whatever as to the profound impression made in Galilee and Judea by Jesus and his work. The fact of the crucifixion is sufficient proof, and the evidence from the gospel material, put forth while multitudes still knew the main facts of his public career, is hardly less weighty. The impression gained from the reported discourses is clear, perfectly consistent, and unquestionably reliable for general characterization of the *human* teacher; this is contemporary material! Some written accounts of his deeds and words must have circulated in his lifetime; it was a literary age in Palestine, and a wide-awake people; but the Messianic idea can hardly have been prominent in any such accounts. He certainly impressed the common people as a prophet, a man endowed from heaven with superhuman knowledge and power—an idea familiar to all. As time went on, and the excitement over his person mounted higher, the crowd hailed him as the long-expected Deliverer; but no sufficient ground for *this* recognition could well have been given at that time. He was no imposing figure, no royal champion, no prince of the Davidic line, but the son of a Galilean carpenter. The evidence that he was indeed the Messiah could be seen only after his death. Fulfilment of scripture was the essential, everything else was secondary. We have in the Gospels themselves (see especially Lk. 24:27, 44 ff.) sufficient indication of the way in which the doctrine was developed.

¹² The adjective merely means to say, that whatever in the "method" is valid has for centuries been known and practised. The study of ancient literature is not a new science, and (judging from what has thus far appeared) there is now before us no new and *sound* formula for pursuing it. This is ventured as the opinion of a single interested observer.

After their master was gone from them, the eyes of the disciples were opened, and they searched the scriptures. They sought out also the reports, written or oral, of the sayings and doings of the Nazarene. The credentials of the Anointed One, evidence such as might convince the Jewish people near and far, grew rapidly in volume and in clearness: the function of John the Baptist as the "Messenger" of Mal. 3:1 and the "voice in the wilderness" of Is. 40:3; the realization of the pictures painted in Is. 42 and 61; the fulfilment (far more important) of Is. 53 and Ps. 22 in the death on the cross; the varied testimony to the resurrection, especially from Is. 53:12 and Ps. 16:10 (Acts 2:27b, 13:35). Had Jesus been willing to be known openly as the Messiah? As to this there were conflicting reports, imperfect recollection, and no settled doctrine. At first it was denied; later, it was increasingly felt that he must have declared himself early.

The Nazarene leaders in Jerusalem had need to spread abroad, without delay, the truth so well known to them but still unknown to the Jewish people. No duty could be more urgent, none could require greater care. The Messiah had come to earth, and had risen from the dead; these things they held to be certain. True, consistent, and (without fail) *convincing* pictures of the heaven-sent being must be sent out in all directions; there were very many who could testify to his deeds and words. Preaching, however necessary, could not even remotely satisfy the need, the time was too short; there must also be teaching through the circulation of written material.

Those who had this vitally important matter in charge determined what was especially necessary to be made known.

That which the people of Galilee and Judea had seen and heard was not enough; there must now be added the testimony of the inner circle of disciples; of the chosen twelve, who knew what no others did or could know; of the three who had been permitted to see yet more. In the person of the Nazarene, and in the details of his human career, they believed, very many prophecies were plainly fulfilled. Moreover he, the divine being, had full knowledge of his coming death, and had foretold it to his nearest disciples, though in veiled terms which they had fully understood only after the resurrection. He not only possessed, but actually exhibited to those who stood closest to him, all the qualities and powers of the Messiah. He told, in plain terms, of his second coming to establish the Kingdom. In the meantime there must be missionary work, at home and abroad.

The whole picture, as it lies before us in our Gospels, is of divinity only. No doubt can have been felt as to any detail, for it had all been reported and was what would have been expected. The passages of Hebrew scripture were brought together in a standard collection for all future use. This was imperative. Without the support of the scriptures they could do nothing; and the proofs must be at hand, correct in form, and well understood. The fundamental teachings just named were made normative for, and essential to, every evangelical composition. Some writings, we may suppose, were already available, and more were quickly furnished. Men of literary skill prepared narratives from the testimony of witnesses, or wrote down discourses preserved in the memory of many hearers. All of this material was given a uniform Messianic redaction, and "gospels" were made up for circulation. These could not be

classed as history, nor as biography, but only as carefully prepared propaganda. We have before us, in our Synoptists, a large amount, perhaps nearly the whole, of this very material. It fits precisely this early time, not any other time. I have styled it "of the first decade" because of my conviction, which I think is well grounded, that the Gospel of Mark was composed in the year 40. Much of the material of which this first of our Gospels is constituted was found in slightly differing Aramaic form, *not* derived from Mk., by the other evangelists.

This authoritative teaching was put in circulation mainly in the manner always common in early times in disseminating popular literature, customary in the orient down to the present day, namely by oral transmission. From Jerusalem, and perhaps also from a few other centers in which written copies had been deposited, men went forth to recite in all parts of the land the text which they had memorized.¹³ In every town there were men who could write down, without substantial loss, what had thus been delivered. Evidence that this was the method pursued appears in all parts of our Synoptic Gospels, for the variation in wording and in substance is (after due allowance has been made for translation) exactly such as results—also at the present day—from such transmission. Records of "the Messiah" thus brought into existence must eventually have found their way into every city and important village in Palestine. The matter was of interest to every Israelite. When it soon became necessary to put the most important part of this mate-

¹³ Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, p. 174: "das Evangelium, das sie [the missionaries] verkündeten, konnten sie auswendig."

rial into well-ordered literary form, it was not difficult to make a collection.

That which is certain, from these practically contemporaneous Jewish records supported by some other evidence, is that the Galilean teacher made on those who saw and heard him an impression which rendered it easy to recognize in him the Servant of Is. 42 and 61. It is clear that he taught a religion of *freedom* and of universal application, expressed so sharply as to arouse the resentment, and the active hostility, of the orthodox leaders of the Jewish people. In all this he was a true successor of the Second Isaiah. "The prophet recognizes, with a definiteness which appears nowhere else in like extent in the Old Testament, the true *proportion* in religion. He declares the customary sacrifices unnecessary: 'I gave you no command of sacrifice, wearied you not with service of incense' (43:23).¹⁴ Instead of fasting, what God wishes is kindly dealing and a heart free from all malice (58:6 f.). The temple at Jerusalem is a holy place and the pride of Israel, but worship anywhere else is just as acceptable: 'What manner of house will you build for me, and where is the place of my abiding?' (66:1). The prophet saw about him too much of the magnifying of rites and ceremonies, the religion of a sacred book. He would see his people throw aside whatever could hold a man apart either from God or from his neighbor. What he proclaims is relief from distress, the world over; peace on earth and good will among men; and all this under the guidance of the divinely appointed and inspired leader, the Anointed One."

¹⁴ The usual rendering of vss. 23 f. is false and very misleading, as I showed in my commentary in *The Second Isaiah*. Vss. 23a and 24a are ironical questions, not declarations!

"This is also the atmosphere of the Gospels. Jesus is consistently represented as antagonizing the theory or practice which magnifies what is outward at the expense of what is inward. He held to the Hebrew scriptures, but opposed a book-religion. He saw certain customs and institutions which in their exaggerated observance both starved the soul and prevented the free and helpful intercourse of men and communities, making them absorbed in themselves and in their shell of inherited conventions and narrow in their sympathy. Against these he contended, always loyal to his own people in the same sense in which the prophet, while sharply rebuking, was loyal."¹⁵

Multitudes could and did see in him the long-awaited incarnation, though neither believing him to be the son of David nor finding it possible to think of him as a military champion. It is certain that he was hailed as the Messiah, and that this led to his death; but there is no trustworthy evidence, anywhere in the record, that he accepted the title or the office for himself.

§5. *The Solidarity of the Gospel Tradition*

By the time when the second of our Gospels (Mt.) was composed, it was very evident that the Jewish people as a whole were reluctant to accept him who was claimed to be their divine leader. The situation called for increasing care in the presentation of the evidence. Each of the two later Synoptists must have felt the need of supporting, as well as supplementing, the work previously done. As far as the original Aramaic was concerned, this was an easy matter, for the material which had been sent forth and spread abroad

¹⁵ "Influence of Second Isaiah," pp. 34 f.

in Palestine was homogeneous and self-consistent. The evangelist was perfectly free in his choice of the texts to be included in his own comprehensive work, and he had no need to book any variation (if there were such) which could introduce contradiction or arouse questioning. Every one knew the value of manifold testimony, of the increased certainty gained from two or more mutually confirmatory accounts of an event. Mt. would naturally choose, if he had the choice, a portion of text here or there not identical in its wording with the text of Mk., and this not merely for the literary reason. Lk. also, a little later, would prefer a new version, if he could find it; Semitic of course, for no other original material was "authentic." Slightly variant texts must have been abundant, widely differing parallels not uncommon. We have in our Synoptic Gospels both, but mainly the former.

For the Greek translators, on the other hand, the task was a little less simple, for they (excepting Lk.) had no choice of material, and were bound to reproduce faithfully what they had before them. In the oral tradition there was no requirement of verbal accuracy—though the reproduction was very often exact. This is well illustrated in the extant versions of Daniel, Tobit, and Judith (to mention no others), and could be taken for granted even without examples. The *viva voce* narrator was allowed a certain amount of freedom in reproducing what he had been given. Some illustration is given in my *Four Gospels*, pp. 258 ff. Quite different was the state of the case in regard to translation. This is the point where "faithful" transmission began, as we see so plainly in the Old Testament, as well as in all the translations of the early time. Here the transmission of

literature was felt to have its beginning; the matter handed about orally was not literature; the popular tales of the 1001 Nights, for example, even in extensive collections, were never thus considered. The compilations made by Mk., Mt., and Lk. were literature, and that of a high order, and they were intended to be preserved in their original form.

The Gospel of Mk. makes the impression of a compendium of the main facts and typical teachings, designed for the now urgently necessary missionary work abroad. It must be in both languages, Aram. and Grk., for both were used in all the Dispersion, as is sufficiently shown (if any proof were necessary) by the use of Targum and Talmud in every part of the Jewish world for centuries to come. Its Grk. rendering was indispensable to those who had the similar task of reproducing the later Gospels.

The Grk. translator of Mt. had before him the double task, perfectly understood and probably prescribed, of reproducing his Aram. original, and, at the same time, of testifying to the verbal accuracy, the trustworthiness, of his Grk. predecessor. We see before us exactly this twofold proceeding. Grk. Mt. ordinarily adopts the words of Grk. Mk. in the multitude of passages in which the two Aram. texts were nearly or quite identical; not merely to save trouble—though in fact time and trouble were saved—but chiefly in order to preserve the reputation for accuracy, the solidarity, of the Christian account. Was the Simon of Mk. 15:21 and Mt. 27:32 a "Cyrenian," or a "rustic"? The Aram. writing would permit either interpretation, and either or both might be true; but Grk. Mk. had settled the matter, it would be worse than needless to choose the other render-

ing and convict him of a blunder. The case is typical of very many. Whether at any time the later translator actually had before him the Grk. text of his predecessor, or rather relied on the accurate verbal memory which was then so common, is immaterial.

Lk. had at his disposal the Grk. of both Mk. and Mt.; and in the very many portions of the two former Gospels which paralleled his own material he employed, as a matter of course, the method of his predecessor. The method needs further characterization, for more was aimed at than substantial accuracy and corroboration of the Grk. tradition; a third factor was obviously important. Mt. could adopt the words of Grk. Mk., and Lk. those of either of the two former translators, only where a true rendering of the Semitic original permitted this to be done. Every real variation in the Aram. must be faithfully mirrored in the Grk. An added advantage of such variation in the Grk. text was the evidence afforded to readers of the Gospels (all of whom knew the requirement of close rendering) that different original documents were used, and accordingly, that each part of the narrative, or of the teachings of Jesus, was attested by more than one witness.

It is possible that a translator might occasionally take over from a predecessor a seemingly important word not found in his own parallel text. In view of the conflation constantly accomplished by mere scribes no such instance could be *proved*—and every Grk. text which we possess is more or less eclectic; but it may be legitimate to inquire whether the last two words of Lk. 9:25 (for example) may not have been adopted, by Lk. himself, from the very close

parallels in Mk. and Mt. The evangelist should probably be given the benefit of the doubt.¹⁸

With these facts in view, every feature of the "Synoptic problem" concerned with textual agreement and variation is perfectly explained, when due allowance is made for the fact that the translators were human beings, with their own habits which certainly in no case were invariable.

There is in this attempted explanation of the genesis of the "many" narratives to which Luke alludes, and of their subsequent employment, less of pure conjecture than may at first appear. I think that every feature of the sketch of literary origins and development presented in this and the foregoing sections will be seen to rest on facts which can hardly be doubted. It all is what would naturally have been produced by the true Messianic program derived directly from the Hebrew prophecies, and by the situation of the first Jewish Christians. There is plenty of room for more of such criticism of the sources, and analysis of our documents, as have been so admirably accomplished by Canon Streeter in his monumental *Four Gospels*; but no conclusion which depends for its validity on the supposition that these writings, or any portions of them, were composed in Greek (excepting, of course, Luke's brief prologue and the 21st chapter of John) can stand.

§6. "Biblical Greek"

The Greek of the Gospels has all of the characteristics of the language of the LXX; there is no other parallel. The

¹⁸ The curious Grk. word in Lk. 11:3, rendered "daily" in Mt. 6:11 (probably Aram. *tēdirā*, "recurring, regular," used in exactly this way in the Targums in speaking of a daily provision of food) was most likely interpolated from Mt. by an editor or scribe, not by Lk.

attempt to show something similar in the papyri utterly fails; nothing at all comparable to the language of the Four Gospels has been or can be produced. If anything really similar should be found in literary papyri (a happening not even remotely probable), it would be recognized, no generally accepted doctrine forbidding, as a translation; while the comparison with the Greek of the vulgar papyri is merely ridiculous.

"The language" of the Gospels; for a single uniform linguistic coloring, easily recognized by those equipped to see it, runs through them all, and is dominant. Every Greek idiom has its corresponding Aramaic idiom, which it reproduces. There is no chapter (excepting Jn. 21), nor any considerable section of narrative or discourse, which does not show plainly its Semitic character. Indeed, the fact has been so successfully and repeatedly demonstrated by Semitists that the foremost exponent of N.T. science, in every land, now recognize a decided Semitic, more specifically, Aramaic, tinge in the idiom of each one of the four books.

Speculation as to the origin of this "tinge" has produced strange theories. Especially common has been the "explanation," that the authors of the Gospels "thought in Aramaic, while they wrote in Greek." That is, as Wellhausen expressed it, there was a Jewish-Greek jargon, half Aramaic, which was the native tongue of (some of) our evangelists.¹⁷

¹⁷ Wellhausen, it should be said, was debarred from holding any comprehensive and definite theory of translated gospels by his firmly held view of their late origin. For him, an absolutely fixed point was provided by his identification of the Zachariah of Mt. 23:35 f. with the Zachariah who was killed by the Zealots in 67 or 68 A.D. (Jos., *Jewish War*, iv, 5, 4). This he repeated in many places and insisted upon with some vehemence, not without ridicule of those who hold another view. Mt., accordingly, was composed in the last decades of the century, Lk. decidedly later, Jn. later still.

The identification, attractive and proposed long ago, was shown by Whiston

Aside from the Gospels and I Acts, however, there is no trace of the existence of this jargon at any time or in any place. Is it not strange that *all* of our records of the life and work of Jesus and of the beginnings of the Christian church should have been composed by men imperfectly fitted for their great task? Jargon does not seem to have been the language of the early Christians generally; was Greek so little used, were Greek scholars so hard to find, that it was necessary to be satisfied with an awkward *patois*?

The supposition that men whose mother tongue was Aramaic, and who were only half acquainted with Greek, undertook to compose these records in the latter language instead of giving the work into the hands of men who had a right to it, would be extremely improbable even if only *one* of our documents were believed to give evidence of the queer proceeding; but when it is applied to *several* of them, it is simply absurd. Even Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 401) queries whether this might not have been the case in the Fourth Gospel; and he thinks of the speech of "a Highlander or Welshman." But neither Streeter nor any other scholar can produce a parallel case, in any period of history: a great literary work (and Mt. and Jn. were such works) written throughout with the vocabulary of a highly literary language, but with the idiom of a border dialect. In this case, moreover, the idiom is not of a border dialect, but of a foreign literary tongue.

As I showed, with some illustration, in my *Four Gospels*, pp. 240-243, each of the evangelists exhibits a large vocab-

(note on the Jos. passage) to be unsound, and was completely refuted by the late G. F. Moore (J.A.O.S., vol. 26, pp. 317-323), whose acquaintance with Jewish literature, and with Jewish Aramaic, was superior to Wellhausen's.

ulary, always accurately employed and generally fitted with admirable skill to the corresponding Semitic, which is easily recognized; in every case the vocabulary of a learned man. And it is always true, in gaining a writing knowledge of a foreign language, that its *idiom* is learned before its vocabulary can be faultlessly used throughout an extensive work.

Furthermore, as to the existence of the supposed "jargon," the late Professor Thackeray, in his *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek*, pp. 26 f., handed down an authoritative opinion which ought not to be overlooked. The more scientific study of the Greek papyri and the Koiné, he says, has "given the death-blow to the theory once held of the existence of a 'Jewish-Greek' jargon." There has been too much *unscientific* use of papyri and Koiné, in dealing with the language of the Gospels without adequate knowledge of Aramaic or acquaintance with translation Greek. But why speak of a "death-blow"? the theory was dead before it was born.

The Third Gospel is generally given special treatment in this discussion, for probably no one supposes that Luke's mother tongue was Semitic. Any student of either Aramaic or Hebrew can recognize the foreign idiom constantly appearing in the Greek of this Gospel; how account for it? It is not often that attempt is made to explain it. Certainly *this* evangelist knew the language in which he wrote, and it is taken for granted that in this regard he was better equipped than the "imperfectly educated" writers of Mk. and Mt.; consequently what he wrote must, somehow, be good Greek. Wellhausen, as will be seen, recognizes a considerable part of the Semitic element here, but avoids any discussion of it.

The favorite way of attempting to account for the strange-sounding dialect of the Third Gospel is to suppose that Lk. devised a sacred idiom of his own, a sort of "Biblical Greek" derived from the LXX. This very superficial explanation is even farther from the mark than the jargon theory. It is true that Lk. very often avoids the abrupt beginning of a new paragraph with a bare "and," or with no conjunction at all (in the Aramaic manner), by adopting the "And it came to pass" of the Greek O.T.; but here the "imitation" ceases. All the other Semitic idioms, "Biblical" only in the sense that they are translation Greek, are Lk.'s faithful and skilful reproduction of the text which lay before him. The examples which Wellhausen (*Einleitung*, 1911, pp. 7 f.) produces are *all* of this character; no faithful rendering of either Aram. or Heb. could avoid them, and they are precisely as characteristic of the one language as of the other. The sanctity of solecisms is a delusion.

The manner in which the author of this Gospel is commonly supposed to "revise" the Grk. of his predecessors is curiously set forth in the commentaries which give special attention to the diction of the Synoptists. Why does he make such an immense number of petty alterations in texts which are comprehensible as they stand? The ordinary way of incorporating an important text, Grk. or Semitic, was to reproduce it unchanged, though obvious errors might be corrected. Lk.'s changes almost never illuminate what had been obscure, but throughout make the impression of a play with words which is not always easy to explain. He "omits as needless" a phrase of Mk. or Mt.; wishes to gain variety; "prefers a more dignified word"; improves the order, or "the style"(!); would avoid repetition; makes "a strange

alteration of the idiom [of Mk. or Mt.] to a less literary use" (why?); transposes paragraphs "in order to avoid monotony"; "objects" to this or that noun or verb, and substitutes another; etc.

Yet, after all this amount of meticulous tinkering, what is brought forth is frequently awkward, uncouth, unidiomatic. Any high school boy fairly well trained in Greek composition would be ashamed of such sentences as 10:38a or 22:54a. As Greek, they are not merely miserable, they are inexcusable. As *translation*, they are admirable, for they give exactly what was aimed at, and is now most welcome, the wording of the original text; any expert can restore the underlying Aramaic. As in the LXX, the style of the rendering is of no consequence, and was not considered.¹⁸ The reason why Lk. substitutes "a less literary use" (see above), or "objects" to words used by Mk. or Mt., is because in these places he prefers an exact rendering of his original.

Similarly Mt., in his supposed revising of the language of Mk., seems to be guilty of a large amount of aimless and fruitless manipulation; but in reality he emerges as a very competent translator, rather than an editor of low mentality.

Wellhausen's treatment (or rather, lack of treatment) of the language of Lk. resulted from his false theory of Gospel origins (see above). Convinced that we are dealing with documents of late date, originally composed in Greek, though an Aramaic "Urmarkus" was supposed, his eyes were closed to the meaning of the evidence before him. In

¹⁸ An excellent example of this sort in Jn. is the passage 2:23 f. Cf. LXX i Sam. 17:4-8. The little suffixes had to be rendered with painful fulness.

his *Evang. Lucae* he noted a large number, a long succession, of Aramaisms all the way from chap. 4 to chap. 24. Several times he recognized "eine schriftliche aramäische Grundlage" (p. 11, on 4:25-27), but failed to see the patent fact that such a *written* "Grundlage" is present in every part of the Gospel. In his *Einleitung*, p. 79, he remarked that the most of the material (not derived from Mk.) in Mt. and Lk. came from "a tradition" which originated "in Jerusalem or at least in Palestine and Syria." And on p. 26 he expressed his opinion that the Gospel material in general, which from the first was Aramaic, was written down in that language. Of the origin of this very extensive written material, its remarkable homogeneity (explained in §4, above), and of the way in which this literature (not oral tradition!) was used by the evangelists, his work shows that he had no clear idea.

In regard to Lk. it remains to be said, that of all the Four Gospels it is the one which gives by far the plainest and most constant evidence of being a translation. His habit as a translator resembles that of Aquila.

What Wellhausen says on pp. 28 ff. in regard to the Aramaic of Palestine in the first century gives in part a false impression. We know the literary Aramaic of that time (and the language of the Gospels was, throughout, the literary idiom) much better than we know the classical Hebrew. The Grk. renderings are so literal that the expert reader can usually see not merely the idiom, but the precise words. And we see that we can trust the translators, though they make their inevitable slips; and that the texts which they rendered had suffered very little corruption; that is evident. The language which they produced, recognized

in its true character, has a dignity which it did not before possess. It is not the result of awkward attempts at writing made by half-trained men, but the very skilful rendering of precious documents in the way that could preserve them most perfectly.

OUR TRANSLATED GOSPELS

Chapter I

AMBIGUITY OF THE ARAMAIC TEXT

THE manner in which these Semitic texts were written provided snares and pitfalls in plenty for any interpreter but the most careful. The difficulty caused by the absence of vowel signs is well known, and a subsequent chapter will treat of cases in which mistranslation resulted from a false vocalization. The consonant text has some ambiguities of its own, though they are rarely serious if the writing is clear. The fact that *daleth* and *resh* are written exactly alike occasionally makes trouble, as in Mk. 7:3 (Exhibit XVI, A), and Lk. 13:33 (Exhibit XXI, C). In some forms of Aram. script *waw* and *yodh* resemble each other very closely; and there are other cases of the kind, see for example the curious mistake in Jn. 5:34 (Exhibit XXII, C).

An illustration may be taken from the O.T., where such little difficulties with the consonant text are not only to be seen on every page, but also are easily demonstrated. Am. 3:11 originally contained the prediction: "An enemy will encompass the land," צר יסבב הארץ; and this text was rendered by the Peshitta. The Massor. text reads: "An enemy, and round about (the land)," צר וסבב; the result of mistaking *yodh* for *waw*. The Greek has: "A Tyrian round about," Τύρος κυκλόθεν, צרי סבב; a curious division of the consonants, and a characteristically irresponsible translation. The treatment of the passage also illustrates the possibility of misunderstanding because of the lack of vowel

letters (in the second word); the fact that in Jewish documents "the land" (otherwise "the earth, the world") means *the land of Palestine*, as in Lk. 2:1 and Acts 11:28 (Exhibit XV, C); and the further fact that the translator is under no obligation to make good sense; this fact illustrated frequently in the Gospels, as it is constantly in the LXX.

From the fact that the consonant text was written continuously, with no indication of single words, it might be expected that a false division would sometimes be made by the reader or translator. In the O.T. tradition there are numerous examples of this error, some in the Massor. text and others attested by the LXX. In the Gospels, however, I have found only a single instance, namely in Jn. 10:7; a clear case, and one of very great interest. See Exhibit XIX, B.

The examples of ambiguity which are to be given in the present chapter are not like those which thus far have been considered, difficulties caused by misreading consonants or confusing vowels. It more frequently happened that the words of the original text were correctly deciphered and pronounced, and yet were misunderstood. The range of possibility of such misunderstanding is so great as to surprise any one not long familiar with Semitic texts and translation Greek. This is a subject which has often been treated in the case of Hebrew, and it will suffice here to name a few of the typical ways in which a false rendering was brought about in dealing with Aramaic texts.

The little Aram. word *dī* easily leads the field as a maker of trouble. It is used as the relative pronoun, masc., fem., or neuter; it may include the demonstrative antecedent ("he who," "that which," etc.); it is constantly employed to indicate the genitive relation, where English "of" would

be used; it serves as a conjunction, introducing final clauses, object clauses, etc. In cases of ambiguity, the Grk. translator chose the meaning which first suggested itself, with an even chance (one is tempted to say) of getting the wrong one. This variety of mistranslation, a false rendering of *dī*, was admirably demonstrated by Burney in the Fourth Gospel. Of the many examples given in the following pages, those in Mk. 10:6, 14:68(!), Mt. 8:9, Lk. 7:47, and Jn. 5:36 are among the more interesting.

The Grk. translator is likely to choose *the most common* meaning of a word, whether it suits the particular passage or not. There are also many "standing equivalents," a certain Sem. word being regularly rendered by the same Grk. word, without much regard to the context. Thus, Aram. *ābed* is in the Grk. always "bondservant, slave," though this is ridiculous in Mt. 18:23 ff.—Aram. *rēmē*, passive participle (lit. "thrown"), means "lying." Therefore in the Grk., Mt. 8:6, the centurion's servant is "thrown down" in the house; vs. 14, Peter's wife's mother is "thrown down" and suffering from fever; 9:2, the paralytic is "thrown" upon a pallet; Mk. 7:30, they found the child "thrown" upon the bed, etc., etc.—The numerous *idiomatic* uses of the Aram. verb *qērā* ("call, cry") are covered by the single Grk. verb *φωνεῖν*, whether it signifies the summoning of some one from a distance, the invitation to a feast, the outcry of men in excitement, the giving of a title (Jn. 13:13; as constantly in Heb. and Aram.), or the crowing of a cock.—The Aram. verb *nēfal* is always rendered "fall" in the Grk., though its signification is sometimes active (as in Heb.), not merely passive. The Grk. mistranslated in Mt. 17:15; for the demoniac youth did not accidentally "fall"

into the fire, or into the water, he *threw himself* in. Characteristic Semitic examples: Gen. 24:64, when Rebekah caught sight of Isaac in the field, she "fell" off the camel. Mt. 4:6 (Syr.), on the pinnacle of the temple the devil said to Jesus, If you are the Son of God, "fall down" from here. Jn. 21:7 (Syr.), when Peter knew that it was Jesus, he girt his coat about him and "fell" into the lake. These two examples, from the Old Syriac, are especially interesting because the Grk. from which they were translated did not contain the word "fall."¹⁹

Such examples as the preceding could be multiplied, from the Gospels, to an amount which would fill many pages. They illustrate the ever-present fact, familiar from the LXX, that the Grk. translator's first duty was to render *words*. Sufficient illustration from each of the Gospels is given in the following pages. Notice also certain interesting examples of Lk.'s habit as a translator, mentioned in Exhibit XIV, A.

The great freedom in the order of words of the Aram. sentence, and especially the manner of emphasizing a word by putting it at the beginning or end of a clause, occasionally produced ambiguity, as the translator rendered word by word. In this way arose the strange reading in Mk. 7:3, where the Jews are said to wash their hands "with the fist." Hence also the "already," which in the Aram. of Jn. 4 stood at the end of vs. 35, was by the Grk. translator made to stand at the beginning of vs. 36. Argument for the date of the Gospel has been based on this translator's error—for

¹⁹ They also seem to illustrate a certain freedom of rendering, very noticeable throughout this old Syr. translation, which is characteristic of versions known by their authors to be secondary; such as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the Aramaic which (as I believe) underlies the Bezan Grk. The author, or authors, of the Sinaitic Syr. must have known that the Gospels were originally Semitic, and the Grk. a translation.

such it certainly is. Another similar instance is the false position of the phrase "because of this" (*'al dēnā*), which now forms the beginning of Jn. 7:22, whereas it was intended to end the preceding verse. Ordinarily, indeed, it stands at the head of its sentence or clause.

The frequently abrupt beginning of the Aram. sentence, without introductory conjunction or adverb, sometimes misleads the Grk. translator, where the context leaves room for doubt as to the connection intended. An example is Lk. 21:12 f., where the parallels in Mk. and Mt. make it certain that the true reading is: "Before kings and governors, for my name's sake, you will be brought for testimony." A more important instance is the passage Lk. 24:9 ff., in which the honor of being the first to bring to the disciples the news of the resurrection is by the Grk. translator taken away from Mary Magdalene and Joanna and Mary the mother of James, and given to "the other women."

The incessant Semitic parataxis creates ambiguity in the Gospels, as in the LXX. Successive clauses in varied mutual relation are likely to be strung together by the ever-repeated conjunction *waw*; usually rendered "and" in the Grk., even where it obviously means "while, when, but, for, although, since," etc. The *circumstantial clause* thus fails, now and then, to come to its rights. The first clause of Mk. 3:32 in our Grk. is incorrectly translated and given a false connection. As originally written, it formed the close of the preceding sentence, giving in express terms *the reason why* Jesus' mother and brothers stood outside and sent word to him, instead of coming in: "*because* a crowd was settled about him." In the parallel, Lk. 8:19, this is plainly stated. Cf. Gen. 22:12, Heb. and Grk., also Ps. 60:13.—Lk. 18:7:

"Will not God give justice to his elect, . . . *even if* he is slow to anger in their behalf?"—Jn. 2:13: "*When* the pass-over drew near, Jesus went up to Jerusalem."—An example of the parataxis without a conjunction: Jn. 1:2 f., "*When* he was in the beginning with God, all things were made by him."—Two other examples, Mk. 5:21 and Jn. 18:25, are described in Exhibit XX, A, F.

There seems to be good reason for mentioning the passage Jn. 19:14 among the illustrations of ambiguity in the Aram. text. The verse reads: "It was Friday of the passover week,²⁰ about the *sixth* hour." Mk. 15:25 says, "the *third* hour." The time at which the crucifixion took place must have been definitely remembered and reported by very many of the people of Jerusalem and Judea; it could not easily be forgotten. A discrepancy of three hours in actual testimony on this point is hardly credible. The other specifications of time: "early in the morning," Jn. 18:28, "the sixth hour" and "the ninth hour" of the Synoptists, seem to give strong support to Mk.'s statement. The mistake must have occurred in the written transmission. The words for "third" and "sixth" are not at all alike in either Greek or Aramaic. No plausible theory can be based on the Greek numeral signs, as various attempts have shown. When, however, attention is paid to the signs of the Semitic numerals, and to the possibility of mistake which they offer, there appears a solution which it is easy to accept. The sign for the numeral 3 is the letter *gimel*. As thus employed in the Jewish coin-

²⁰ In support of this rendering I would refer to my article, "The Date of the Crucifixion according to the Fourth Gospel," *J.B.L.*, vol. 50, pp. 227-241, the fruit of a new examination of the Palestinian terminology. The conclusion there reached was, that the above rendering is the only one justified by the evidence which we now possess.

age, to denote the "third year," it has the form $\beth$; thus on both shekel and half shekel, see G. F. Hill, *Greek Coins of Palestine*, Plate XXX, 5, 6. The letter very frequently appears in this form, more or less varied, in the earlier copper coinage; see Hill, pp. 184-187, 204-207, Plate XX, 13, 14, and especially his Table (facing p. cxii) of the Hebrew letters occurring on the coins, from which it appears that *gimel* often had the shape $\beth$, almost exactly like the *waw* of the square character which was in common use! Observe also, in this Table, in the section relating to the coins of Alexander Jannaeus, that even then and there the same character, precisely, might represent either one of the two letters.

Now this is not the form of *gimel* which was chiefly used at the beginning of the present era, other forms were more common; and the strong probability that as used for *three*, after the manner of the Jewish silver coinage, it would be confused, in a written document, with the familiar square-character *waw*, the numeral letter for *six*, is very obvious.

Exhibit I. Ambiguity of the Aramaic Text.

- A. Mk. 3:5 according to the Greek: Looking around upon them WITH ANGER (ܩܪܝܢ), etc.
True rendering: Looking around upon them IN DISTRESS (same Aramaic), etc.
- B. Mk. 4:4 (Mt. 13:4, Lk. 8:5) ac. to Grk.: As he sowed, some (seed) fell BY THE WAYSIDE (ܥܠ ܐܦܝܪܝܢ).
True rendering: As he sowed, some (seed) fell ON THE HIGHWAY (same Aramaic).
- c. Mk. 4:8 (and parallels) ac. to Grk.: Other (portions of

seed) fell on good ground, and yielded fruit, GOING UP AND INCREASING (אִלֵּין וְרִבִּין), and bore, ONE thirty (חַד חֲלָתִין), etc.

True rendering: Other (portions of seed) fell on good ground, and yielded fruit IN CONSTANT INCREASE (same Aramaic), and bore THIRTYFOLD (same Aramaic), etc.

- d. Mk. 4:12 (Mt. 13:13, Lk. 8:10) ac. to Grk.: (Jesus speaks in parables to the common people) IN ORDER THAT (יִד) they may see indeed, but not perceive; and hear indeed, but not understand.

True rendering: (. . . to the common people) WHO (same word) "see indeed, but do not perceive; and hear indeed, but do not understand."

Exhibit I, A (Mk. 3:5). No sufficient ground for *anger* on the part of Jesus is shown, either in this passage in Mk. or in the parallels in Mt. and Lk. (Mt. 12:9-14, Lk. 6:6-11). He was grieved, Mk. says, at the "dullness of comprehension" of those who could not see that the sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath. Even modern teachers can meet stubborn callousness without anger, and in this case the opponents of Jesus had the excuse of a deep-seated custom, however unreasonable.

The root *rgz*, both Hebrew and Aramaic, originally signifying strong *agitation*, had become more and more exclusively used for "anger," and it is thus consistently rendered by the Greek translators of the Gospels. The most conspicuous example of the resulting mistranslation is Jn. 11:33, 38, which must be compared in any discussion of the present passage. The word signifies "distress, deep sorrow," in such passages as Targum Ps. 6:8 and Job 17:7. The best single

example of the older meaning, however, is 2 Sam. 19:1 (18:33). It was not "in anger" that David went up to his chamber weeping for Absalom.

Exhibit I, B (Mk. 4:4, and parallels). One would suppose that seed falling "by the wayside," i.e., in the edge of the field through which the road runs, would be likely to take root and send up its growing plant; why not? Wellhausen, *Evang. Marci*, has this surprising comment (surprising, that is, as coming from one who had thought of Mk. as a translation!): "One would expect 'on the road,' not 'beside the road.'"

The Aram. phrase corresponding to the Greek is, literally, "on the highway," the preposition in this and similar phrases normally meaning "beside"; as we say in English that a man lives "on" such and such a street, without implying that he lives in the middle of it; or, that his house is "on" the Hudson river, not meaning that he occupies a house boat. But the Aram. phrase may, of course, have the far less common meaning, "on (the surface of) the road," and that is the sense which plainly is demanded here, since that is the one place where the seed *could not* sprout.

The Aram. text rendered by Lk. says this very distinctly: the useless seed is *trodden by wayfarers*, as well as picked up by birds. Lk.'s mechanical way of translating is excellently illustrated here, for he simply follows Mk. and Mt. in their false (though most natural) rendering, "beside(!) the road." The Aram. narrator who produced the Lucan version gave the parable concisely, but clearly and forcibly.

Exhibit I, C (Mk. 4:8, and parallels). The translator of Mk. missed *two* Aram. idioms in this verse. He rendered according to the sense, "going *up*" instead of "going *on*,"

meaning "continually" or "more and more" (the idiom frequently used in Heb. also), and failed to give—if he saw it—the true force of the numeral "one" before the "thirty, sixty, and a hundred." Lk. renders correctly his "hundred-fold" in 8:8. Wellhausen, *Evang. Matt.*, p. 68, attempted to explain the Grk. of Mt. 13:23 from that of Mk., but the attempt is clearly mistaken. It is on the contrary evident that Mt.'s Aram. original differed slightly here, as in vs. 8, from that of Mk., though having the same meaning: "some (producing) thirty, some sixty," etc. Greek Mt.'s *ho men*, with the *neuter* pronoun, is the usual (and excellent) rendering of Aram. *ithai di*, "some," exactly as in Lk. 8:5, where the pronoun has so puzzled the commentators.

Exhibit I, D (Mk. 4:12, and parallels). Jesus did not devise his parables in order to prevent the common people from understanding his teaching. Greek Mk. had nevertheless some excuse for his rendering, inasmuch as he thought especially of the famous, oft-quoted passage Is. 6:9 f. (instead of Jer. 5:21 and Ezek. 12:2). It is to be observed that Lk. 8:10 has the same rendering, and this, if there were no other parallel, might be taken to indicate that a genuine "learned" interpretation of Jesus' use of parables had been recorded by the evangelists—an interpretation quite comprehensible. The fact, however, is quite otherwise. Lk. merely follows his custom of adopting Mk.'s rendering where nothing prohibits, and in this case he follows a blind guide, for, as Mt. shows, Mk. mistranslates. The Aram. particle which he renders by "in order that" is the pronoun-conjunction *di*, that very widely used and ambiguous little word which has occasioned such a number of false renderings in the Gospels, notably in Jn. Greek Mt., in the parallel

passage 13:13, renders it very suitably by the conjunction "because." It seems clearly best, however, to take it in its primary meaning, as the relative pronoun, which is the reading of the Targum—the accepted interpretation—in Is. 6:9.

The long quotation in Mt. (13:14 f.) was not in the original text of this Gospel, but has been interpolated bodily from Acts 28:26 f. Similarly, the last clause in Mk. 4:12, "lest they should repent and be forgiven," wanting in Mt. and Lk. and incongruous with this context, seems to be secondary; but it probably was added in the original Semitic text, before the Greek translation was made. It does not agree at all with the LXX, but corresponds word for word with the Targum.

Exhibit II. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Mk. 9:15 ac. to Grk.: When the crowd saw him, they were GREATLY AMAZED (תִּירָוּ), and running to him saluted him.
True rendering: When the crowd saw him, they were MUCH EXCITED (same Aram. word), etc.
- B. Mk. 9:49 ac. to Grk.: EVERY ONE (כָּל) WITH FIRE (שֶׁשֶׁ) will be salted(!).
True rendering: ANYTHING (same word) SPOILING (same word) is salted.
- C. Mk. 9:50 ac. to Grk.: Have salt in yourselves, and BE AT PEACE (אֶשְׁלָמוּ) one with another.
True rendering: Have salt in yourselves, and HAND IT ON (same word) one to another.

- D. Mk. 10:6 (Mt. 19:4) ac. to Grk.: FROM THE BEGINNING (מִלְקַדְמִין) OF CREATION (דִּי בְרָא) he made them male and female.

True rendering: IN THE BEGINNING (same word) THE CREATOR (same Aram.) made them male and female.

- E. Mk. 14:38 (Mt. 26:41) ac. to Grk.: WATCH (עוֹרֵן) and pray, lest you ENTER INTO TEMPTATION (תַּעֲלִין בְּנוֹסְיָנָא).

True rendering: AWAKE (same word), and pray not to FAIL IN THE TEST! (same words).

Exhibit II, A (Mk. 9:15). The Aramaic verb conjectured here expresses strong excitement. Whether the emotion is surprise, fear, joy, or grief can be learned only from the context in each case. It is this verb, beyond much doubt, that is uniformly rendered in Mk. 1:27; 10:32; 14:33; and 16:5, as well as in the present passage. Its most common use is to express astonishment, and so it is rendered, by both LXX and Theodotion, in Dan. 3:24, of Nebuchadnezzar's emotion when he saw the four men walking about in the blazing furnace. Its use in Mk., however, is likely to revert to the original meaning; in only one of the five passages (1:27) is the emotion of surprise predominant, and in two of them (10:32 and 14:33) it is utterly out of place; see the note on 10:32.

In the present passage, no reason for surprise on the part of the bystanders is indicated; nor is any explanation of it obvious, or even plausible. The best parallel is to be found in the Old Syr. rendering of Jn. 11:31 (the use of the verb in Syr. being in general the same as in Western Aram.), where Mary "sprang up in eager haste" (as the Grk. says) to go to Jesus. Frequently a word is added to make plain the

precise meaning of the verb; as in Targ. Ps. 73:4 (fear), Mk. 14:33 (distress), *Acta Mart. et Sanct.*, ed. Bedjan, IV, 314: "I was beside myself *with joy*," etc. In the Marcan passage now before us, the onlookers were "thrown into eager excitement" (very naturally) by the sudden appearance of Jesus. The mistranslation in the Grk. illustrates the danger of using a "standing equivalent" in rendering.

Exhibit II, B (Mk. 9:49). The mistranslation in this verse is amusing, as well as remarkably interesting. It obviously is as impracticable to salt a person with fire as it would be to fire him with salt.

The proceeding of the Grk. translator is as instructive, and as certain, as anything in N.T. criticism. Vs. 48 is a direct quotation from the O.T. (Is. 66:24), and in the original text of Mk. was therefore, of course, in Hebrew. The translator, having rendered *hā'ēsh*, "the fire," in this verse, and seeing *bā'ēsh* in vs. 49, of course supposed that the Heb. was continued; and in fact, the verse makes perfect Hebrew (such a case could only rarely occur). He gave the verse connection with the preceding, whereas it really was the beginning of a new section corresponding to Mt. 5:13.

The ancient editors of the Grk. text saw that something must be done—and they did it. Searching the Grk. O.T. scriptures, they found one other example of "shall be salted," and accordingly slipped Lev. 2:13a in, to cover the nakedness of the verse in Mk.

Exhibit II, C (Mk. 9:50). The true rendering is obvious from the preceding verse, taken together with its parallel, Mt. 5:13. These few men were the salt of the earth, but neither the sufficient nor the permanent supply. Being

"at peace" has nothing to do with the matter. The Aram. verb, in just this form, could have either meaning, but there can be no question which was intended. A capital example of the idiom in Heb., rendered "be at peace with," using this verb-stem and the preposition *l*, may be seen in Job 5:23. The ellipsis of the direct object (perfectly regular, since the noun had just been given) made the mistranslation easy.

Exhibit II, D (Mk. 10:6, and parallel). The establishment on earth of the human pair, male and female, was not "at the beginning of creation," but at the end of it. The Grk. translator either did not know the Palestinian terminology, or else (more probably) he merely proceeded in the usual mechanical way. The preposition *min*, rendered "from" by all the translators wherever it occurs, in this phrase means "at"; and *dī b'rā* is a standing term for "the Creator." The latter Aram. word was taken as a verbal noun corresponding to the Heb. infinitive in Gen. 5:1.

It is important to notice that Mt., with the same Aram. words before him, rendered correctly (except for the inevitable "from the beginning"); and comparison of the passage (19:4) shows immediately the nature of the mistake made by Grk. Mk.

Exhibit II, E (Mk. 14:38, Mt. 26:41, Lk. 22:40, 46). The general injunction to the three disciples, to watch and pray, in order to be kept from temptation to sin, is not what would be expected at the climax of the scene in the garden. It is hardly strange that some commentators (Wellhausen, Klostermann-Gressmann) have thought it possible that words spoken on another occasion have (somehow!!) been inserted here. But the "watch" cannot be thus treated; it is the same "wake" which we read in vss. 34 and 37, and which

is all too painfully suited to the present situation. The *repetition* of the words in Lk., at the beginning and the end of the scene, is highly significant; this was no general injunction, but a warning of what was about to come. The supreme trial of the disciples' fidelity to their master was at hand; it was the time to keep awake and pray for strength!

The word rendered "temptation" meant originally, and commonly, "testing, trial," and this alone does justice to the situation. It follows of necessity, that "*enter into*" the test means "*succumb to*" it. No amount of praying could save the disciples from undergoing the ordeal, they could only pray not to fail. All interpreters make connection with the Lord's Prayer; and there, certainly, "let us not succumb to temptation" is the rendering which stands on a level with the other petitions.

There is here an idiom of Palestinian Aramaic. Lagrange, *Comm.*, refers to the conjecture of St. Jerome (on Mt. 26:41) that the figure is that of "entering" a snare or trap (instead of seeing and avoiding it). This might seem plausible in another context, but the figure is hardly definite enough, nor forcible enough, for the present passage. Now the Aram. verb '*al*' is regularly used of the setting of the sun, which "goes in" when it passes under the earth; and in a single late passage of the O.T. (Is. 24:11) the Heb. verb of sunset is tropically used: "all joy has *gone under*," i.e., has perished utterly, as LXX, Lat., Syr., Targ. all render.²¹ This is a very natural figure of speech, familiar in other languages. With our knowledge of the existence of the idiom in late Hebrew, and in our certainty as to the virtual

²¹ The rendering of the English Bible, "is darkened," is decidedly inferior; too weak for the verse—note the parallel clause—and unsupported by other use of the verb.

meaning of the verb in this Marcan passage and its parallels, I think we may safely take the literal meaning to be, "pray not to go *under* in the test!"

Exhibit III. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Mk. 14:68 ac. to Grk.: I neither KNOW (עָדַי) nor UNDERSTAND (מָה־יָדַעְתִּי) THAT WHICH (דָּךְ) you say.

True rendering: I am neither A COMPANION OF (same word), nor do I KNOW AT ALL (same word), HIM OF WHOM (same word) you speak.

- B. Mt. 5:32 (Mk. 10:11, Lk. 16:18) ac. to Grk.: Any man who divorces his wife on any other ground than that of fornication MAKES HER AN ADULTERESS (מְגִירָהּ לָהּ).

True rendering: Any one who divorces his wife on any other ground than that of fornication, [and marries another,] COMMITS ADULTERY WITH HER (same words).

- C. Mt. 6:6, 18 ac. to Grk.: Pray to your Father WHO IS IN SECRET (דָּךְ בְּכִסְיָא), and your Father who sees IN SECRET (בְּכִסְיָא) will reward you.

True rendering: Pray to your Father PRIVATELY (same words), and your Father who sees WHAT IS HIDDEN (same word) will reward you.

- D. Mt. 19:17 (cf. Mk. 10:18, Lk. 18:19) ac. to Grk.: Why do you ask me about the "good thing" (טָבָא)? ONE THERE IS WHO IS GOOD (חָד הוּא טָבָא).

True rendering: Why do you ask me about the "good thing"? THE GOOD IS ONE (same words).

Exhibit III, A (Mk. 14:68; cf. Mt. 26:70, Lk. 22:57, 60). The reading of the Grk. is pure nonsense, for if

Peter did not *know* what the girl said, it is worse than useless to make him add, that he did not *understand* it, either! This is a sentence that no author could write; but when it is supposed to be the original text, of course all translators must translate it.

Are we not led by the narrative to expect Peter to *deny* Jesus at this point? He does not do so, according to our Greek. Littmann, *Z.N.T.W.*, 34 (1935), p. 25, thinks that "I do not know what you mean" (he omits the preceding words, "I do not know what you say"!) can be regarded as "Verleugnung." But even with this use of only the easier half of the text, the explanation will not do. Peter would be only *temporizing*, which is a very different thing from *denying*. It would be open to him at the next opportunity, after having gained this little respite, to confess that he *did* know Jesus. We happen to know that he did not do so, but that makes no difference. What the narrator intended is perfectly plain from vss. 69 and 71 f., as well as from vs. 30; and the conclusion is quite unavoidable, that something is seriously wrong with the Grk. of vs. 68.

It is strange that Wellhausen, who entertained the idea that Mk. was translated from Aramaic, should have failed to see the obvious explanation; knowing, as he did, the ambiguity of the relative pronoun, and the idiomatic use of the two verbs meaning "to know." The former verb is regularly used in Heb., Aram., and Syr., to express personal intimacy, as is familiar to all students of these languages; the other Aram. verb has the general meaning, "to know, recognize" a person or thing. The use of the two verbs here is calculated to give the utmost emphasis to Peter's denial.

As for the parallel passages, Mt. 26:70 and Lk. 22:60, it is

unnecessary to suppose that the two later translators were influenced (as of course they might have been) by Grk. Mk.'s rendering, for in perhaps 95 cases out of 100 the phrase *dī āmar ant* would mean, "that which you say"; while in the 5 remaining cases the verb could have the meaning, "name, designate," which is equally idiomatic. These three passages are capital examples of mistranslation.

Exhibit III, B (Mt. 5:32, 19:9, and parallels). The saying attributed to Jesus in the Grk. of Mt. 5:32a is a very strange utterance indeed. The husband divorces his wife, without any flagrant infidelity on her part, and the result is, that *she* commits adultery. Whether the husband incurs similar guilt, is not stated. Hebrew law, and Jewish public opinion, in such cases gave the wife a clean slate, and in this decision the opinion of our own day would doubtless concur. Will Jesus now reverse this judgment, pronouncing the dissolved union adulterous, and with such emphasis that only the guilt of the woman is mentioned? This seems incredible, and it is not a view which interpreters of the passage have thought reasonable.

He "makes her commit adultery." In what way? Montefiore, *Syn. Gospels*, II, 66, gives the accepted explanation: "by marrying another man." But the woman was under no obligation to marry again—and she might well think that one trial was quite enough. However, she probably *would* marry, say the commentators, and the second marriage would be adulterous. But this is mere quibbling. The plain fact is, that the declaration attributed to Jesus, if made without qualification, *is not true*. The divorcing husband does *not* compel the divorced wife to commit adultery. If she chooses to marry again, it is not her former husband who

makes her do so. It is hardly necessary to add, that the saying, "he puts her in the way of committing" the sin, would be a very weak conclusion after the impressive introduction.

This difficulty disappears as soon as the original language is called in to help. The translator saw before him the derived stem of the verb, and rendered it as causative, for the reason which will presently appear; but he was mistaken. In each of the several verbs, Heb. and Aram., which have this signification, "commit adultery," the simple stem and the derived (intensive) stem are interchangeable, with no difference in meaning. Moreover, the noun or pronoun designating the person with whom the adultery is committed is very likely to be appended to the verb as (or in the manner of) the direct object. These facts are set forth in every lexicon, and may be seen illustrated in Jer. 29:23 (Heb. and Targ.), Lev. 20:10, Prov. 6:32, Targ. Hos. 4:13, and especially Targ. Job 36:20, an exact parallel to the phrase in Mt. The true rendering here is, "he commits adultery *with her*." But with whom?

The real source of the difficulty with the passage is now brought plainly to light. The verse is defective, with two words missing. The phrase, "*and marries another*," which is found in 19:9, and in the parallels in Mk. and Lk., is indispensable to the sense, and *must have been omitted by accident from the Aram. text of 5:32*. The fact of the omission gave the Grk. translator the best of reasons for his rendering. For the cause of the accident, and the two missing words, see p. 159.

Exhibit III, C (Mt. 6:6, 18). The phrase, "that which is in secret," is the object (equivalent to a cognate object) of the two verbs, "pray" and "fast," the latter verb understood

instead of being once more repeated. The use of the Aram. preposition in "sees what is hidden" is noticeable. It is only for the rhetorical effect—always studied by Mt.—that it is employed in these two passages.

Exhibit III, D (Mt. 19:17, and parallels). Mt.'s Aramaic text was the original. The saying, "The good is *one*," was a bit too philosophical, however, for popular audiences, and the interpretation which appears in Mk. 10:18 and Lk. 18:19 took the field at once. The Grk. translator of Mt. had the Marcan rendering before him, and did his best to conform to it, with unfortunate result. He should have used the neuter gender, instead of the masculine, throughout his second clause.

Exhibit IV. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Mt. 21:9 ac. to Grk.: Hosanna to(!) THE SON (לְבִן) of David!
True rendering: Save THE SON (same word) of David!
- B. Mt. 21:43 ac. to Grk. The kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to A NATION (עַמִּי) yielding its fruit.
True rendering: . . . given to PEOPLE (same word) yielding its fruit.
- C. Mt. 23:38 (Lk. 13:35) ac. to Grk.: Behold, your house IS LEFT TO YOU (בְּיָדְכֶם לְכוֹן).
True rendering: . . . IS TO BE ABANDONED BY YOU (same words).
- D. Mt. 26:70 ac. to Grk.: He denied before them all, saying, I do not know WHAT YOU SAY (see note on Mk. 14:68).

True rendering: I do not know HIM OF WHOM YOU SPEAK.

- E. Mt. 27:62 ac. to Grk.: On the morrow, WHICH IS AFTER THE PREPARATION (בְּיוֹם הַכֻּזָּר), the chief priests and the Pharisees came together to Pilate, etc.
True rendering: On the morrow, THAT IS, AFTER SUNSET (same words), the chief priests and the Pharisees came, etc.

- F. Mt. 28:1 ac. to Grk.: LATE ON(!) THE SABBATH (בְּאַחֲרֵי הַשַּׁבָּת), AS IT DAWNED TO (בְּנֶגְהֵי) the first day of the week, etc.
True rendering: AFTER THE SABBATH (same words) AND BEFORE THE DAWN OF (same word) the first day of the week, etc.

Exhibit IV, A (Mt. 21:9, Mk. 11:9 f.). It is perhaps hardly fair to charge Grk. Mt. with *mistranslation* here. He knew, of course, the meaning of "hosanna" (each one of the four translators of our Gospels was a master of the three languages, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, as is sufficiently shown), and he also knew that this verb invariably takes a direct object, with or without the use of *eth* or *lamedh*. He had, nevertheless, two good reasons for his rendering. (1) In the original text of Mt. the Heb. quotation, in three perfectly metric lines (characteristic of Mt.), contained the preposition (*lamedh*) before "son of David," as I shall try to show elsewhere. This the translator would reproduce. (2) Grk. Mk. had transliterated the "hosanna," twice, and Grk. Mt. wished, as usual, to follow this lead. The Grk. dative case was the solution, accomplishing both objects; a characteristic specimen of the translation jargon.

"Save the Messianic king!" is the meaning of the curious phrase, reminiscent especially of Ps. 20:7, 10 (where LXX has the true reading), while the next-following clause quotes from 118:26. Both psalms were originally Messianic, not merely thus interpreted in the time of Jesus. The last clause of Mt. 21:9 and Mk. 11:10, strictly rendered, "Save him, (Thou) on high!", is strangely replaced in Lk. 19:38 by a variation of the doxology of 2:14. The reason why Mk. transliterated his "hosanna" is evident. In the text which he rendered the imperative stood alone, as in Ps. 118:25, without an expressed object. He would reproduce the shout of the people; no word of translation could give such a vivid touch.

Exhibit IV, B (Mt. 21:43). This is another example of false rendering by the use of a "standing equivalent." In this context, "nation" is absurd; for even if we could suppose the author of the Gospel to have forgotten what he wrote in vs. 31, he must certainly have known what he was going to say in vs. 45!

The Heb. and Aram. word *'am*, which commonly means "nation," and is thus rendered approximately one hundred times in the LXX, signified here, as often, simply "people" in the most general sense (German *Leute*). The translator, however, can hardly be blamed for his rendering.

Exhibit IV, C (Mt. 23:38, Lk. 13:35). The saying which in our Grk. text is attributed to Jesus, "Your house is left to you," is meaningless. Hence the attempt to give some meaning to it by adding the word "desolate," found in numerous ancient Mss., but generally recognized as an interpolation. A similar modern attempt, made by Well-

hausen in his commentary, gives a far-fetched and indefensible interpretation.

The Aram. original of the phrase is certain, and its meaning perfectly obvious. The preposition denotes the agent, "by you," as usual with the verb or participle in the passive voice. The participle, regularly rendered by the Grk. present tense, represents, as commonly, the impending future. Every Jew who had read or heard the Heb. prophecies knew that shortly before the Messianic triumph Jerusalem was to be seized and held by the Gentiles, with accompanying slaughter and exile. See especially Zech. 14:2.

Exhibit IV, D (Mt. 26:70). See note (above) on Mk. 14:68.

Exhibit IV, E (Mt. 27:62). The reading of our Grk. text, "On the morrow, *which is after the Preparation*," has naturally seemed strange to readers and commentators. It is as though one were to write in English: "on the morrow, which is after Friday"! Why did not the evangelist write, simply: "On the morrow, which was the sabbath," if he wished to specify the day at all?

The phrase rendered "which is" (not, *was*) indicates special interpretation; it is the Aram. *id est*, "that is," and it calls attention to the precise meaning which the word "morrow" has here. There was obvious need of interpretation, for the word, in Greek or Aramaic as in English, is ordinarily understood to mean the broad day—after the dawn—following this or that day, the events of which have been narrated; and this meaning would not do at all in the present case! If the chief priests and Pharisees had delayed presenting their request to Pilate until the morning of the sabbath, the disciples of Jesus would have had plenty of time to take

the body from the tomb and carry it away (27:64, 28:13). The application for a guard was made immediately after the burial, as soon as the place of the interment was known, and the evangelist saw strong reason for making a clear and unequivocal statement of the fact.

Mt.'s chronology of the Passion and Resurrection agrees in all respects with the dates and hours given in Mk., Lk., and Jn.,²² with the single exception of the "sixth hour" in Jn. 19:14, which obviously is the result of a mistake in the transmission of the text (confusion of the numeral letters signifying "three" and "six"? See Chap. I, p. 7), since 18:28 says that Jesus was brought before Pilate *early in the morning*; cf. Mt. 27:1 and parallels. The four narratives agree in representing that the crucifixion took place on Friday, the day after the paschal supper, and that the burial was accomplished on that same day, just before sunset. Mt. alone narrates the incident of the application to Pilate for a guard of the tomb; and here, as has been shown, the Grk. translation must be corrected.

The Aram. word *'arūbā*, the standing term for the day of "preparation" for the sabbath, originally meant *sunset* (see Targ. Ps. 104:23). Then, in the familiar evolution of meaning, it came to signify "evening," and "*eve*" (of a festal day). Thus resulted, in Jewish Aramaic, the ordinary employment of the word to designate the sixth day of the week, "sabbath *eve*" (like the German *Sonnabend*); and this meaning, so very common in use, soon took almost complete possession of the word. The Grk. term used to translate it may be misleading in its ambiguity; thus, in Jn. 19:14 the

²² See my article, "The Date of the Crucifixion according to the Fourth Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 50 (1931), 227-241, where complete proof, from new evidence, is furnished.

correct rendering of παρασκευῇ τοῦ πάσχα is "Friday of Passover week." In the verse of Mt. now before us the Aram. word was used in its original sense, "sunset," as the context shows, and the example is important for the lexicon of Jewish Aramaic.

Exhibit IV, F (Mt. 28:1). This is a particularly fine example of translator's nonsense. The Grk. renders admirably, according to the canons of that day; but the curious idiom of the original cannot be rendered closely, in any non-Semitic language, without losing its meaning and creating confusion. The familiar Aram. phrase (translated also into Talmudic Heb.) designates ordinarily the time between the close (sunset) of one day and the dawn of the next day, and may apply either to the entire time or to any part of it. In the present case, it happens to apply to the latter part of the night, before dawn. "Late on the sabbath" is a ridiculous rendering, though faithful to the Grk. It is also quite incorrect to suppose that "as it began to dawn" (German, "in der Dämmerung") gives the true meaning of the latter part of the phrase. The word "dawn" is there, it is true, but as it is employed in this idiom, the time intended could equally well be midnight, or any hour before or after it.

The same idiom precisely, using the same word (*dawn!*) is found in classical Syriac. In the *Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite*, ed. Wright, p. 22, line 9, it designates the whole "night between Friday and Saturday." In Bedjan's *Acta Mart. et Sanct.*, IV, 579 f., the time is "at midnight"; *ibid.*, 629, "at the eleventh hour of the night."

The facts in regard to the use of this peculiar phrase in

Jewish Aram. and Talmudic Heb. were set forth very fully, with abundant references, by George F. Moore in the *Journ. Am. Oriental Soc.*, Vol. 26 (1906), pp. 323-329. They seem to have been unknown to the N.T. commentators (including Wellhausen), who suppose Mt. to have misunderstood this and that in Mk., and in general to have made a bad mess of the account at this point. Mt.'s Aram. text differed indeed considerably from Mk.'s, but contradicted it in no respect. Allen, *Comm.*, Klostermann-Gressmann, and probably others, have been misled by Dalman, *Gramm.*, 2nd ed., p. 247, notes 2 and 4. The reference in the former note cannot apply to Mt. 28:1, and the phrase referred to in note 4 is only part of the idiom described here. Dalman's further remark, "Vom Morgengrauen ab ist die Bezeichnung unmöglich," is also incorrect, for, as Moore (p. 325) shows, the phrase quoted is sometimes made to include the whole of the following day. See, further, the note on Lk. 23:54.

Exhibit V. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Mt. 28:17 ac. to Grk.: When they saw him, they prostrated themselves, BUT SOME DOUBTED (וְאִתָּם מִתְפַּלְלִין).
True rendering: . . . they prostrated themselves, EVEN WHILE DOUBTING THEIR SENSES (same words).
- B. Lk. 1:66 ac. to Grk.: And all who heard gave heed, saying, "What will become of this child?" FOR INDEED THE HAND OF THE LORD WAS WITH HIM (וְיָד אֲדֹנָי עִמּוֹ).
True rendering: "What will become of this child? FOR THE HAND OF THE LORD IS WITH HIM" (same words).
- C. Lk. 2:11 ac. to Grk.: There is born . . . a Saviour, who is ANOINTED LORD (מְשִׁיחַ אֲדֹנָי).

True rendering: . . . a Saviour, who is THE ANOINTED OF THE LORD (same words).

- D. Lk. 8:14 (Mk. 4:19) ac. to Grk.: By cares and wealth and the pleasures of life, AS THEY GO THEY ARE CHOKED (אֲנִלִּין וּמִתְחַנְקִין).

True rendering: By cares and wealth and the pleasures of life THEY ARE GRADUALLY CHOKED (same words).

- E. Lk. 8:29 (Mk. 5:4) ac. to Grk.: Often IT HAD SEIZED HIM (אֲחִיד בֵּהּ); and he was kept under guard, bound with chains, etc.

True rendering: Often HE HAD BEEN TAKEN BY FORCE (same words) and kept under guard, bound with chains, etc.

Exhibit V, A (Mt. 28:17). The strange words, "but some (or, others) doubted," are a distressing blot on this thrilling scene. If there were no strong reason to suspect the reading, we could only accept it, with sorrow; but the fact is quite otherwise. Who were the "others"? What could they doubt? What value is there in the statement, and why is it expressed in such a peculiar Greek phrase? No commentator has been able to throw light on these things.

The phrase is explained when recourse is had to the Aram. verb signifying "doubt." The eleven were *divided* (the root meaning) between two strong emotions. Similarly, in the Jerusalem Targum to Gen. 45:26, when Jacob hears that Joseph is alive, his heart is "divided (this same verb) between fear and hope." So in the post-resurrection scene in Lk. 24:41, the disciples were "*unbelieving for joy*"; and only a like expression could do justice to the moment. What

the eleven saw was sure, and yet it was incredible. As they fell on their faces before their master, they were only *half* able to believe what they saw. The conjectured Aram. (lit., "and also doubting") must have been the original reading, for it perfectly explains the Greek.

Exhibit V, B (Lk. 1:66). The narrative of the Nativity, comprising chaps. 1 and 2, was composed in Hebrew, and by Luke was rendered from that language into Greek; as I demonstrated in 1912, in *Studies in the History of Religions presented to C. H. Toy*, pp. 290-295.

The words in vs. 66, "for the hand of the Lord was with him," are commonly said to be a remark thrown in by Lk. himself. If this were the case, it would do scant credit to his literary sense. The remark does not apply to subsequent events, the word "for" connects it unmistakably with the sentence just preceding, and it can only be called a weak and utterly superfluous appendage to the marvel recounted in vs. 64 and the excited comment of the people of all that region.

Lk. has mistranslated, and the nature of his error is evident. The words above quoted formed a "circumstantial clause," introduced by the conjunction *waw*, and (as usual) with no verb expressed, the clause *forming the continuation of the people's outcry*, where it is really needed. The evangelist, rendering mechanically, inserted the verb "was," whereas he should have written "is."

In several other passages in the Gospels, such circumstantial clauses are either misunderstood or given a false connection. See Mk. 3:32, 5:21, Lk. 18:7, Jn. 1:2(!), 2:13.

Exhibit V, C (Lk. 2:11). The Grk. has a false read-

ing here, but how it came about is uncertain. "Lord" without the article is strange, and "Christ" in the Gospels is never a proper name. The phrase is unexampled, and in this context quite incredible. B. S. Easton, *The Gospel ac. to St. Luke* (1926), asks: "Was the original perhaps 'the Lord's Anointed'?" and J. M. Creed (1930) raises the same question. The reading thus suggested, found also in vs. 26 (and a very frequently occurring phrase), is undoubtedly what the author wrote.

It seems unlikely that Lk. mistranslated. More probably one of the earliest copyists made the same alteration in the Grk. text which was made in the Grk. of Lam. 4:20 and Ps. Sol. 17:36.

Exhibit V, D (Lk. 8:14; Mk. 4:19). A well known Heb. and Aram. idiom is illustrated here. It is several times lost to sight, with more or less unfortunate result, in the literal Grk. rendering of the Gospel translators. "*Going and*" doing, or experiencing, this or that, is a way of expressing *constant increase* of the action or experience; but it is not an idiom that would be rendered freely, with its true meaning, in either O.T. or N.T. In Mk. 4:8 (see above) the translator, missing the idiom completely, renders *ad sensum*, "going up." In 4:19, parallel to the present passage in Lk., it is almost certain that he did the same thing, representing the cares and pleasures of life as "going *in* and choking the word," instead of choking it *increasingly*. The same Aram. word (plur. participle) must have stood in all three passages. Some commentators (Klost.-Gressm., Creed) have recognized the Semitic idiom in Lk. 8:14, comparing it with LXX 2 Sam. 3:1, but without drawing the only natural conclusion, that our Grk. is translated.

The Fourth Gospel has two examples of this idiom, both mistranslated: 12:11, "many of the Jews *went and* believed on Jesus," instead of, "many of the Jews, *in increasing number*, believed." 15:16, "I appoint you to *go and* bear fruit," instead of, "I appoint you to bear *more and more* fruit." If the fact of translation were not otherwise established beyond question, neither of the two passages could be claimed for the idiom, though the verb of "going" is at least superfluous, and commentators (Zahn, Bauer) on 15:16 remark that the word is ill suited to the phrase.

Exhibit V, E (Lk. 8:29; Mk. 5:4). "It (the demon) often seized him" is a strange thing for the narrator to say without further explanation, after having said that for a long time this man had been possessed, and was living the life of a wild beast among the tombs in the open field. According to Mk. and Mt. he was all the time dangerous and untamable.

The vs. Mk. 5:4, telling how the attempt had often been made to bind the maniac securely, but without success, is inserted here in Lk.'s narrative, as though by afterthought. The two verses are so nearly parallel, after the first clause of Lk. 29, that Lk.'s error in rendering is evident. The "often" of both narratives shows that the "seizing" in Lk. was not by the demon, but by the officers of the law. The two phrases, "it seized him," and "hands were laid on him," are expressed in the same form of words. According to the meaning intended in both narratives, and preserved in Mk., the Aram. passive participle was used impersonally; Lk., on the other hand, rendered it in its active use, equally idiomatic, but wrong in this instance.

Exhibit VI. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Lk. 9:25 (Mk. 8:36, Mt. 16:26) ac. to Grk.: What is a man profited, if he gains the whole world, but loses HIMSELF (ܠܢܦܫܐ)?
True rendering: . . . but loses HIS LIFE (same word)?
- B. Lk. 9:51 ac. to Grk.: When the time came FOR HIS ASCENSION (ܠܡܫܝܠܐܝܬܐ), etc.
True rendering: When the time came FOR HIM TO GO UP (same word), i.e., to Jerusalem, etc.
- C. Lk. 11:33 ac. to Grk.: No one lights a lamp and puts it IN A CELLAR (ܠܬܝܒܐ).
True rendering: No one lights a lamp and puts it IN HIDING (same word).
- D. Lk. 11:36 ac. to Grk.: If your WHOLE (ܠܟܠܐ) body is full of light, the WHOLE (ܠܟܠܐ) of it will be full of light, etc.
True rendering: If your WHOLE (ܠܟܠܐ) body is full of light, ALL (ܠܟܠܐ) will be light, just as the lamp lights you with its brightness.
- E. Lk. 12:49 ac. to Grk.: I came to cast fire on the earth, and WHAT DO I DESIRE IF (ܐܝܢܐ ܕܝܬܝܢܐ ܕܝܬܝܢܐ) it is already kindled?
True rendering: I came to cast fire on the earth, and HOW I WISH THAT (same words) it were already kindled!
- F. Lk. 19:42 ac. to Grk.: IF (ܐܝܢܐ) you knew . . . what is for your welfare! but now it is hidden from your eyes.

True rendering: WOULD THAT (same word) you knew . . . !

Exhibit VI, A (Lk. 9:25, and parallels). In another context, "gains the whole world, but *loses himself*" might not be challenged, though the enigmatic phrase does not sound like any word of Jesus. As Easton (*Comm.*, p. 141) remarks, "lose himself" is "a curious expression that seems to have no exact parallel." But the testimony of the preceding verse, joined to that of the exact parallels in Mk. and Mt., shows that Lk. mistranslated, in giving to the Aram. word the meaning which it usually has. He had the same word before him, twice, in the preceding verse, but in each case was debarred from this rendering by the immediately following clause.

This illustrates a standing characteristic: even more than the other ancient translators, *Luke renders words*; faithfully, meticulously, often ingeniously, but very frequently without much regard to the context. Numerous examples will appear in the sequel. Also, this passage will be given further mention in the chapter: The Reflexive Pronoun and its Substitutes.

Exhibit VI, B (Lk. 9:51). The time of Jesus' *ascension* had by no means arrived! The Aram. verbal noun ("going up") must have been used in the various Christian communities very extensively in the theological sense, in the years immediately following the death of Jesus. In this sense it was especially familiar to Lk., and he rendered accordingly.

Exhibit VI, C (Lk. 11:33). Had Lk. never seen a cellar? Did he not know how cellars were used? Doubtless on the day when he wrote these words, hundreds of men in

Antioch (or wherever he lived) could have been seen to "light a lamp and put it in a cellar," with very useful result. To express the general truth intended here, the word is ill chosen.

The reproach does not fall upon Lk., however. He had no thought of a "cellar," nor can it have occurred to him that the word which he used might be thus interpreted. The ancient translators of his Grk. understood him perfectly. Jerome has *in abscondito*, and the Syr. versions render in the same way. He merely uses the feminine adjective, "hidden." Why feminine? Because in the Aramaic language the neuter gender is expressed by the feminine, as in the adverbial phrase before his eyes. It is simply his meticulous way of translating such phrases. He does precisely the same thing in 14:18; see *The Four Gospels*, p. 311. If he had had occasion to translate the passages Mt. 6:6, 18, where Grk. Mt. employs the neuter gender, he would have rendered just as he does here; without thinking that any one could interpret: "Pray to your Father in a cellar, and your Father who sees in a cellar will reward you."

Exhibit VI, D (Lk. 11:36). In the Grk., this is a passage of notorious difficulty, with its absurd tautology. It is no wonder that some of the oldest versions omit the verse altogether, for as it stands it is worse than useless. The word-for-word retroversion into Aramaic shows at once the true meaning, with no possible ambiguity. The *second* "all" is the *noun* so frequently used in both Heb. and Aram. The figure is carried through consistently: the eye is the lamp of the body; the *man* who is lighted is the lamp of his surroundings. Mt. 6:23, last clause, seems to have the same meaning (though one could wish that the clause itself had a little

more light): If *you* are dark within, how dark *everything* will be!

Exhibit VI, E (Lk. 12:49). Many commentators and translators have given here what I have termed the "true rendering," but without justification, for the text as it stands is clear and idiomatic, and means something else. Their rendering, as Plummer, *Comm.*, truly says, "does rather serious violence to the Greek." References to the LXX merely show that we are dealing here with translation from a Semitic original. This is not "Aramaic-Greek jargon," for (if there had ever been any such literary jargon!) it could never have included a phrase of this nature. It is not "sacred language," for it repeats nothing found in the Grk. Bible. Even if Lk. had been attempting to deceive his readers, making them think that he was translating Semitic documents when in fact he was composing in Grk., he could never have hit upon such a phrase as this; for it would not sound Semitic at all, but would merely give good Grk. with a false meaning. Was he not sufficiently familiar with his own language to know this? It is simply his usual exact, word by word, rendering (and in this case mistranslation) of the Aram. text before him. No other conclusion is plausible.

Exhibit VI, F (Lk. 19:42). A passage closely allied to the preceding. In this case, the Grk. makes good sense; but the sentence would have been smoother and more forcible if the rendering of the Aram. had been correct, not merely literal. Both here and in 12:49 the particle of wishing might have been either *illū* or *hēn*; there is no way of deciding between the two.

Exhibit VII. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Lk. 21:25 ac. to Grk.: And on the earth distress of nations, IN PERPLEXITY FOR (בְּשִׁגְוִי) the roaring of the sea and its billows; men fainting for fear, etc.
True rendering: And on the earth distress of nations IN TUMULT (same word), "the roaring of the sea and its billows," men fainting for fear, etc.
- B. Lk. 22:60 ac. to Grk.: Peter said, MAN, WHAT YOU SAY (וְנִכְרָא דִּי אֲמַר אֲנִי) I do not know.
True rendering: THE MAN OF WHOM YOU SPEAK (same words) I do not know.
- C. Lk. 23:54 ac. to Grk.: AND IT WAS FRIDAY, AND THE SABBATH WAS DAWNING (וְנִדְחָא יוֹמָא דִּי עֶרְוֵתָא נִדְחָא שְׁבִתָּא).
True rendering: IT WAS NOW THE NIGHT BETWEEN FRIDAY AND THE DAWN OF THE SABBATH (same words).
- D. Lk. 24:9 ff. ac. to Grk.: (The women) returned (from the tomb), and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest. They were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James; and the other women with them told these things to the apostles(!). And these words appeared in their sight as idle talk, etc.
True rendering: They were Mary Magdalene, and . . . the mother of James, and the other women who were with them. But when they told these things to the apostles, their words appeared to them as idle talk, etc.

Exhibit VII, A (Lk. 21:25). It may seem too prosaic treatment of a poetic passage to comment, that neither the Jews of Palestine nor the most of the inhabitants of the earth

would know whether the sea was roaring or not; and yet this fact is doubtless the reason why portents of the sea play no part in the standard Hebrew-Jewish eschatology (*Four Gospels*, p. 313). "Parthians, Medes, Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Cappadocia and Phrygia, in Egypt and Arabia" (Acts 2:9 ff.) might see the stars fall from heaven, but they could neither see nor hear the waves of the ocean. It approaches the ridiculous to picture the world powers as pausing in their death struggle to wonder why the sea is reported to be stirred up! That which is visualized here is the last act in which the hostile Gentiles will appear, and there is unquestionably allusion to the classical passage Is. 17:12 f., where the "tumult of many nations" is to be "*like the roaring of the seas, and the rushing of mighty waters.*" The influence of this picture in the subsequent Hebrew literature is curiously shown in Ps. 65:8, as Duhm, *Die Psalmen*, has observed. In neither case is there direct quotation, but only reference to the familiar prophecy. Cf. also Jer. 51:55, which gives the same picture of rushing armies ("their waves roar like mighty waters") at the end of the present age.

Luke misses the allusion, as is not surprising. It would have been overlooked by almost any translator; moreover, I have elsewhere shown good reason for believing that Lk. was not especially familiar with the O.T. scriptures, nor accustomed to quote from them (*Composition and Date of Acts*, pp. 55-57). He could only render as he did, for the "roaring sea" must be given some connection with the human actors who now occupy the scene. The word which might mean "perplexity, confusion, tumult" seemed to be in the construct state, and so he renders it; in reality it was

in the absolute state. The phrases in the Aramaic are rhythmical and high-sounding. The passage read:

וְעַל אֲרָעָא עֲקָתָא עֲמָמִין בְּשָׁנוּשׁ הָמוֹן יָמִין וְגִלְיָן

Exhibit VII, B (Lk. 22:60). The mistranslation here is the same which was made in Mk. 14:68; see the comment on Exhibit III, A. As was there remarked, it is not necessary to suppose that Mk.'s rendering influenced Lk., for any translator is likely to render a phrase according to its most common meaning. In this *third* denial, in the same scene with the others and following close upon them, "I do not know what you say" (!) sounds particularly foolish.

The statement that the third denial "followed close upon" the others requires a comment. The dramatic scene is pictured in this Gospel as in Mk. and Mt., which at this point say "soon after" (Mk. 14:70, Mt. 26:73). Lk.'s "after about an hour" is the very familiar mistranslation of Aram. *shā'ā*, which commonly signifies an indefinite short time, very often "moment" (Augenblick). He had in his Aram. text the same phrase, precisely, which occurs in Dan. 4:16(19). Did Daniel stand before Nebuchadnezzar "about an hour," in his embarrassment, before beginning to speak? The Grk. translator (Theodotion) assures us that he did.

As for the word "man," at the beginning of Peter's denial, Lk. very naturally rendered it as in vs. 58, where it was vocative. This is possible, but on the other hand: (1) The emphatic position of the word, taken as direct object, adds a certain sharpness to the denial; (2) it may not be merely accidental that both Mk. and Mt. have the noun at this point. Jesus was just a *man*, of whom Peter had no personal knowledge, and of whom he wished to hear no more.

Exhibit VII, C (Lk. 23:54). This is an amusing speci-

men (and perfectly typical) of the literal translator's nonsense. Each of the two statements made is flatly false, for it was neither Friday, nor was the dawn of the sabbath even approaching. The time intended is obviously the evening which was the beginning of the sabbath. Lk. was confronted with the same standing Aram. idiom which has already been discussed in dealing with the passage Mt. 28:1, in which the Grk. translator, though doing his best, was unable to make any acceptable sense (see Exhibit IV, F). I explained this passage, and also Mt. 28:1, in *Studies . . . presented to C. H. Toy* (1912), pp. 300, 315 f.

Exhibit VII, D (Lk. 24:9 ff.). This case is different from any of the preceding. The Greek offers an absurd reading, not because of mistranslation of word or phrase, but because of a false division of sentences. It seems certain that Lk. intended no pause after the words "the other women with them." If that had been the case, the next word, the verb "they told," would have been accompanied by a conjunction. In the original Aram. text, on the contrary, the new sentence began, as a matter of course, with the unaccompanied verb. This might easily happen without special reason, for at this point Jewish Aramaic differs from Hebrew; but in the present instance the decisive factor was the *repetition*, after interruption, of that which had been said in vs. 9. A precisely similar case is to be seen in Dan. 5:4.

In this connection, another example of Lk.'s false division of sentences may be presented. In 21:12 f. both sense and parallels show the fact unmistakably. The Grk. reads (Engl. R.V.): "Before all these things, they shall lay their "hands on you, and shall persecute you, delivering you up "to the synagogues and prisons, bringing you before kings

"and governors for my name's sake. It shall turn out unto "you for a testimony."

True rendering: "Before all these things they will lay hands on you and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and bringing you into prisons. Before kings and governors, for my name's sake, you will be brought (perhaps *yittōbal b'kōn*) for testimony."

Comparison of the Grk. of Mk. 13:9 and Mt. 10:17 f. shows plainly the division of clauses intended in the text which Lk. translated. After he had made the very easy mistake of connecting "synagogues and prisons," the rest of his translation followed of necessity. See also *The Four Gospels*, p. 313.

Exhibit VIII. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Jn. 5:36 ac. to Grk.: But I have the witness, WHO AM GREATER THAN (ܐܝܢ ܕܝܗܝ ܕܥܠܝܐ) John.
True rendering: But I have the witness OF ONE WHO IS GREATER THAN (same words) John.
- B. Jn. 5:44 ac. to Grk.: How can you believe, who receive glory one of another, but seek not the glory that comes from THE ONLY GOD (ܕܝܗܝ ܕܐܠܗܐ)?
True rendering: . . . but seek not the glory that comes from THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN-SON OF GOD (same words)?
- C. Jn. 11:33, 38 ac. to Grk.: Jesus sees Mary weeping, and goes to the tomb of Lazarus, IN ANGER (ܕܝܕܝܢ).
True rendering, in either passage, DEEPLY MOVED (same word).
- D. Jn. 12:11 ac. to Grk.: Because of him (Lazarus) many of the Jews WENT AND BELIEVED (ܐܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܗܝܡܝܢܝܢ) on Jesus.

True rendering: Because of him many of the Jews, MORE AND MORE, WERE BELIEVING (same words) on Jesus.

E. Jn. 15:16 ac. to Grk.: I have ordained you, TO GO AND BEAR FRUIT (תְּאָלֵין וְתַעֲבֹדֵין פְּרִי), and that your fruit should be lasting.

True rendering: . . . TO BEAR MORE AND MORE FRUIT (same words).

Exhibit VIII, A (Jn. 5:36). This is one of the clearest examples of mistranslation. The English R.V. reads: "But the witness which I have is greater than *that of* John." This rendering, though not ill-suited to the context of the passage, cannot be obtained from the Greek. Weizsäcker's German translation has: "I have a witness, greater than John." The Greek plainly forbids this also. Walter Bauer, *Johannes* (in the "Handbuch" series), renders: "I have the witness in a higher degree than John." This is neither good sense nor justified by the text. The Mss. fall into two main groups, the one giving the adjective "greater" as nominative, the other as accusative. Zahn, *Das Evang. des Johannes*, followed the sound critical principle in choosing the more difficult reading, the nominative, which is also attested by a majority of the oldest and best Mss. Since this reading, which is translated above in the "Exhibit," represents Jesus as making an unpleasing comparison of himself with John, it is no wonder that ancient editors and interpreters "corrected" the Greek.

The translator rendered in the most natural way. The adjective, being masculine, could not be connected with "witness," which is feminine; and it is not strange that the

true meaning of the evangelist's obscure phrase was not seen. "The witness of a Greater than John" is the reading best satisfying the context, for the fact of this divine *and personal* witness is what the whole section, vss. 32-37, aims to present.

Exhibit VIII, B (Jn. 5:44). You are ready, Jesus says, to derive glory from a merely human Messiah (vs. 43b), but are not willing to receive it from the true Messiah, the Son of God. The passage 12:43, sometimes compared, is not parallel, for the context there is altogether different and the "glory" signifies *praise*; whereas in the present passage it is the reflected glory from the Messianic king.

The phrase which our Grk. renders "the only God" is the very same which has already appeared in 1:18 and 3:18; mistranslated in the former passage, see the note. Cf. also 1:14 and 3:16. In 3:33 and 5:27 the same thing is said in another way, see the notes on these passages. The Grk. adjective rendered "only-begotten" is the standing equivalent of a Heb.-Aram. word which is very commonly used in this sense; see, for the Heb., Ps. 22(21):21, 35(34):17. It appears constantly in the Targums in speaking of an "only son." It is also used of God, the "only, unique" One; and the Grk. translator of Jn. has this justification for his rendering here; it is only the context that forbids it.

This is *probably* one of the cases in which the letter *aleph* was written twice by mistake, and the passage will therefore be included in Exhibit XXIII.

Exhibit VIII, C (Jn. 11:33, 38). Jesus sees Mary weeping for her brother Lazarus, and the sight arouses his "anger." Bauer, *Comm.*, explains, that this hot indignation

was caused by the lack of faith in his supernatural power, shown by the sisters and their friends. It was "Beleidigung seiner Majestät." Jesus nurses his resentment, and goes "in anger" to the tomb. Zahn, *Comm.*, tries to make it appear that the "zornige Erregung" was not directed against Mary and the others, but against "die Macht des Todes"(!). Bernard, *Comm.*, appealing to the original meaning of the Grk. verb, to "snort" like a horse, whence "snorting" or "roaring" in wrath, suggests that Jesus was uttering "inarticulate sounds." Thayer-Grimm, *Lex.*, gives "very angry" as the meaning of the verb here.

This is merely another illustration of the straits to which interpreters are driven in attempting to explain our Greek as the text which the evangelist wrote. Jesus was not snorting, on this occasion. He was not enraged by the discovery that death is mighty. And, as I said in a former discussion of the passages (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, 16, pp. 338 f.): "The picture of Jesus fuming with indignation over human faint-heartedness in a time of deep affliction is intolerable, since it is untrue." Fortunately, the explanation of the miserable Grk. reading (miserable, but quite according to custom!) is as obvious and certain as any specimen of mistranslation can be.

The Grk. translator rendered, as usual, according to the most common meaning of the verb; see the note on Mk. 3:5 (Exhibit I, A), where the main facts are stated. Even in the O.T., where the verb is still very frequently employed in its earlier and wider signification, the same false rendering seen in the Gospels occurs several times. In Ex. 15:14 ff. the terror of the nations at the display of Yahweh's might is described. "When the peoples heard it, *they were shaken*";

. . . (vs. 15) "trembling"; . . . (vs. 16) "terror and dread." According to the LXX (Cod. B), in vs. 14, *they were angry*; so also Lat., *irati sunt*. But Cod. A, Syr., and Targ. knew better; and so did Aquila, and Symmachus. So also in Ps. 99(98):1, "The Lord reigns, let the peoples *tremble*, . . . let the earth be shaken." Here again the Grk. and Lat. versions say: let the peoples *be angry*!—the same purely mechanical rendering which we see in Jn. In Is. 23:11, instead of "he has shaken the kingdoms" the LXX has "he has *enraged* the kingdoms." Still another example is Job 37:2, where, according to the Grk. translation, men are exhorted to "hear *in anger*" the voice of the Lord. These examples may suffice to show how the one very common meaning of the verb-root *rgz* is made by the translators to do duty in strange places.

There is one O.T. passage, containing (in both Heb. and Targ.) this verb of "anger," which affords a perfect parallel to the verses in Jn. which tell of Jesus' emotion in the scene at Bethany. We read in 2 Sam. 19:1 (18:33), that when David heard the news of the death of his son Absalom, "the king was *deeply moved*, and went up to the chamber over the gate, weeping and lamenting as he went." In this case, the LXX renders by the verb which should have been employed by the Grk. translator of Jn.

Exhibit VIII, D (Jn. 12:11). "Many of the Jews 'were going and believing' on Jesus." This very familiar Semitic idiom, meaning, "were believing in increasing number," is perhaps hardly in need of illustration from the LXX; see however the following O.T. passages, in which both Heb. and Aram. have the idiom. Gen. 8:3, the waters kept subsiding ("were going and subsiding"); 26:13, the man grew

ever greater ("went and grew great"); Judg. 4:24, the hand of the children of Israel kept growing stronger ("went and grew strong"); 1 Sam. 14:19, the tumult steadily increased ("went and increased"); 2 Sam. 3:1, the adherents of Saul were becoming weaker and weaker ("were going and being weak"). In all these and similar cases, the Grk. trans. of course renders the auxiliary verb, "going, proceeding, went," etc.

Several examples of this idiom in the Grk. of the Gospels have received notice in the preceding pages, viz. Mk. 4:8, 19, Lk. 8:14; see the note on the last-named passage (Exhibit V, D). Another example in Jn. here follows.

Exhibit VIII, E (Jn. 15:16). See the preceding note, illustrating the idiom found in this verse; also the note on Lk. 8:14, where this passage is mentioned.

Exhibit IX. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Jn. 12:34 ac. to Grk.: The people answered him: We have learned from the Law that the Messiah is to remain (with us) forever; how then do you say that the Son of Man must BE LIFTED UP (ܐܢܬܐ ܡܪܝܥܐ ܕܢܬܝܠܐ)? Who is this "Son of Man"?

True rendering: . . . how then do you say that the Son of Man must GO AWAY (same word)? What (sort of) Son of Man is this?

- B. Jn. 13:1 f. ac. to Grk.: Now before the feast of the pass-over Jesus, KNOWING (ܕܥܝܢܐ) that his time had come to depart out of this world to the Father, having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end. And when they were at supper, the devil having already

MADE UP HIS MIND THAT (ܕܝܗܒ ܠܠܒܐ ܕܝ) Judas the Traitor, son of Simon, should betray him, Jesus, knowing, etc.

True rendering: Now before the feast . . . Jesus HAD KNOWN (same word) that the time was at hand. . . . Having loved his own . . . he loved them to the end. And . . . at supper (the devil having already PUT IT INTO THE MIND OF [same words] Judas the Traitor . . . to betray him), he, knowing, etc.

- C. Jn. 14:7 f. ac. to Grk.: If you HAD KNOWN (ܕܝܕܥܝܢܐ) me, you WOULD HAVE KNOWN (same word) the Father also; now you know him, and have seen him.

True rendering: If you KNOW (same word) me, you KNOW (same word) the Father also; now you do know him, etc.

Exhibit IX, A (Jn. 12:34). This is a passage of especial interest and importance, in the present demonstration. Taken in connection with the unmistakable Semitic tinge of Jn.'s Grk., and in view of the fact that the whole adjoining context is characteristically Johannine, it is quite sufficient of itself, without the aid of any other evidence, to show that the Gospel is a translation. For it presents us with a riddle in the author's well-known manner, a mystifying play on words which is the only key to the meaning of an extended passage (vss. 31-36), *and which can be seen only in the Aramaic.*

I discussed the passage at length in the *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, 51 (1932), pp. 320-322; it will suffice here to give the essential facts.

The author of the Fourth Gospel puts into the mouth of Jesus, from time to time, words which have a hidden mean-

ing, sayings which the people understand in one way, while they are meant in another way. Conspicuous among these cryptic utterances are those in which Jesus, addressing the multitude, predicts his own death, in phrases necessarily equivocal. On three occasions he alludes to the *manner* of his approaching death, by crucifixion. In 3:14, the words spoken to Nicodemus seemed a figure of speech, an allegory; in 8:28, his hearers naturally supposed him to speak of "exalting" the Son of Man; in the present passage, 12:32, the meaning really intended by the phrase employed could be seen only by the disciples after his death; those who were listening at the time heard a saying of utterly different purport, for the play on words was such as to turn them aside inevitably.

All those who are acquainted with Palest. Aram. know that the verb which may mean "to be lifted up" is ordinarily used in the middle-voice signification, "to take oneself off, *depart*." Examples in multitude could be given, if there were need of illustration. No one of Jesus' hearers could have supposed him to speak of being "lifted up *from the earth*" (the evangelist himself has to explain this curious phrase, for any reader of the Aram. would have missed the intended sense!); the words which they heard were: "*If I depart from the land,*²³ I will draw all men unto me." They had heard something similar on a former occasion. In 7:33 ff. Jesus had said: "Yet a little while I am with you, . . . where I shall be you cannot come"; and they had reasoned: "Will he go to the Greek Dispersion, and teach the Gentiles?" Now therefore they retort (vs. 34): "You claim

²³ Palestine is always "the land"; hence the mistranslations in Lk. 2:1, Acts 11:28.

to be the Messiah. We read in the scriptures that the Messiah is *to remain here* forever; how is it, then, that you say that you are *to go away*? What sort of 'Messiah' is this?" Jesus permits them their interpretation, saying, "Yet a little while is the light among you, walk while you have the light."

The evangelist's riddle is admirably conceived and presented, perfect in every detail, but the Grk. misses it completely. This of necessity, for (aside from the fact that there could be no similar play on words) vs. 33 had provided the translation of the Aram. phrase.

Exhibit IX, B (Jn. 13:1 f.). A passage of notorious difficulty, *in the Greek*. The connection of clauses is obviously false, and throughout the two verses confusion reigns. (1) It is absurd to say, that before the Passover Jesus loved his disciples to the end; yet from the context it is plain enough that "to the end" is what the evangelist meant. (2) By mistaking a past tense ("knew, had known") for a participle, the Grk. translator managed to hide from sight the purpose of the evangelist to tell what happened *at the Paschal supper*.²⁴ When it is said that Jesus had already

²⁴ Several passages have been supposed to show that the supper was *not* the Paschal meal. For a full discussion of these I would refer to my article, "The date of the Crucifixion according to the Fourth Gospel," in the *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, 50 (1931), pp. 227-241. To summarize: (1) Those who argue from 13:29 seem to be quite unaware that "the feast" lasted for a week. (2) Concerning 19:36: "As a mere matter of textual evidence, there can be no question that Ps. 34:21 is indicated as the source of the quotation." (3) 19:14. In the Palest. Aram. usage of the first centuries C.E. no such phrase as "day of preparation for the Passover" is known, or to be expected. The Grk. word in vs. 14 does not mean "preparation"; as usual in the Gospels, it means *Friday*. The entire festal week was called "the Passover." (4) It is only through singular lack of acquaintance with, or of attention to, the Jewish feast that argument can be based on 18:28. *The great day* of the feast, the holiday of rejoicing, was the 15th of Nisan (Num. 28:17 f.). Since the Jewish householders, in that early morning, would have been debarred from joining in the festivity with

known that the fated time was at hand, the reference is clearly to vss. 23-31 of the preceding chapter. (3) The Grk. translator was unable to decide, from the Aram., whether the devil "made up his mind" that Judas should betray Jesus, or whether he "put it into the mind" of Judas to do this. He accordingly "hedged" in a familiar way, producing a monstrosity which could be tortured into either sense.

In the original Aram. there was just ambiguity enough to account for the bewildering Grk. translation, though no real student of the Gospel could have been in doubt as to the sense. When an exact retroversion into Aram. is made, every difficulty vanishes, and this without the alteration of a single letter. What emerges is a smooth and idiomatic text, briefly but clearly introducing the account of the Last Supper, and completely explaining the translator's Grk. His choice of the participle at the beginning of vs. 1 was doubtless determined by the fact that the same word (apparently) at the beginning of vs. 3, necessarily the participle, seemed merely to resume the suspended construction. As for the clause describing Satan's part in the betrayal, the *grammatical* ambiguity was complete; first, because of the equivocal *dī* (either "of" or the conjunction "that") before the name Judas, and again, because of the *omission* (quite idiomatic) of this particle before the verb "betray." The solution of the mistranslation is perfect.

Exhibit IX, C (Jn. 14:7 f.). The Grk. presents us here with an absurd self-contradiction, a typical instance of what

their relatives and friends on that long-awaited day by the act of entering the Praetorium, it is no wonder that they remained outside the door! The Strack-Billerbeck *Kommentar*, II, 839 below, confirms this expressly. There is no particle of valid evidence that Jn.'s date of the crucifixion was other than that of the Synoptists.

we must expect when we pin our faith to a translator of the old school. After Jesus has told the eleven that they know neither him nor the Father (cf. 8:19, where the same thing is said, in the same words, to the unbelieving Jews!), he goes on in the next breath to assure them that they *do* know the Father; and in vs. 9, as previously in vss. 4 and 6, he declares in plain words that he himself is known to them! See also 15:15, 27; 17:6-8, 25 f.

This is an instructive example of the occasional ambiguity of the Aram. text, and of the unthinking literal rendering. The conditional sentence, in the original, could not tell the interpreter how to translate. In both protasis and apodosis the verb could only be in the perfect tense; exactly as in 8:19, where the Grk. rendering was *correct*; here, it was *wrong*. Another example of the same misunderstanding appears a few verses later, in vs. 28b; see below.

Exhibit X. Ambiguity of the Aram. Text.

- A. Jn. 14:28b ac. to Grk.: IF YOU LOVED ME, YOU WOULD HAVE REJOICED (הָיָה מְרִיטִי לְךָ), because I go to the Father. True rendering: IF YOU LOVE ME, YOU WILL REJOICE (same words), because I go to the Father.
- B. Jn. 14:17, 19 ac. to Grk.: YOU KNOW (יָדַעְתָּ אֲנִי) it (the holy spirit), for it ABIDES (אֵשָׁרָה) with you, and is in you. . . . Yet a little while, and the world SEES (רָאָה) me no longer; but you SEE (רָאָה) me. True rendering: YOU WILL KNOW (same words) it, for it WILL ABIDE (same word) with you, and in you. . . . Yet a little while, and the world WILL SEE (same word) me no longer; but you SHALL SEE (same word) me.

- c. Jn. 16:5 ac. to Grk.: No one of you ASKS ME (ישאלני), Whither are you going?
True rendering: No one of you MAY ASK ME (same word), etc.
- d. Jn. 16:30 ac. to Grk.: Now we know that you know all things, and YOU HAVE NO NEED THAT ANY ONE SHOULD ASK YOU (די ישאלנך גבר לא חשה).
True rendering: . . . and NO ONE (of us) HAS NEED TO ASK YOU (same words).
- e. Jn. 19:35 ac. to Grk.: And THAT ONE(!) (ההוא גברא) KNOWS that he [the evangelist] speaks the truth.
True rendering: And I (same words) KNOW that he [the evangelist] speaks the truth.

Exhibit X, A (Jn. 14:28b). Did not these chosen few, the eleven, love their master? Was he not aware that they did? Read 14:15, 21-23 and 16:27! Here again the false Grk. rendering gives an intolerable sense; see the preceding note, on 14:7 f. In the present case also, the mistranslation consists in a too literal rendering of the Semitic tenses. In both members of this conditional sentence the verbs are those "denoting affections or conditions of the mind," used regularly in the past ("perfect") tense; while the conditional participle was ambiguous.

Exhibit X, B (Jn. 14:17, 19). The disciples did *not* yet know "the spirit of truth," and it was *not* "abiding" in them; the gift of the spirit came later. The reading of the Grk. at the end of the verse, "and (it) is in you," is so patently false that some of the oldest witnesses read the

future tense—as in our English Bible. But there can be no question as to the original Grk. reading.

The Aram. present participle is regularly rendered (on almost every page of the Four Gospels) by the Grk. present tense. Frequently, however, as in Heb., this participle denotes what is impending, soon to take place. This, unquestionably, is the explanation of the impossible saying of Jesus recorded in our Grk. The LXX mistranslates frequently in the same way.

Vs. 19 presents another example of this false rendering of the participle. Jesus is not speaking of the present, but of the future, and the present tense in the second verb of the sentence is disturbing and misleading, for that which is promised is a new condition, not the continuation of one already existing. In this passage and in 16:16 Jesus says: Yet a little while, and (Semitic idiom!) neither the world nor you will see me; nevertheless *you* shall eventually see me. At the end of the verse, in both passages, the Aram. interpreted the more or less ambiguous participles by employing an emphatic future tense—which the translator of course rendered. But *in the Grk.* the transition from pres. tense to future is perplexing (see e.g. Zahn, *Komm.*, p. 560). In order to give the translation the meaning intended by the evangelist, all the verbs (with perhaps the exception of the first person, "I live") should have been future tense.

Exhibit X, C (Jn. 16:5). The reading of the Grk., "No one of you asks me, Whither are you going?" is *absurdly wrong*. The disciples had been asking this question eagerly, but Jesus could only answer them evasively. Peter had put the question directly, in 13:36, and Thomas indirectly, in 14:5. Very evidently, the intention here is to tell the dis-

ciples that they must *not* continue to ask. This is immediately made certain by vss. 17 ff., where the effect of the mild prohibition is seen. The disciples are burning with eagerness to know more, and are querying among themselves: What does he mean, when he says, "In a little while I am going to the Father"? *but they know that they must not ask him*. Jesus sees this, and replies to them with words of comfort, and in the figure of speech in vs. 21; telling them also (vs. 25) that the time will come when he can answer them plainly, not in figures.

The explanation of the absurdity in the Grk. of vs. 5 is as certain as could be desired. The Aram. jussive, "let no one of you ask me," has here (third person sing. imperf.) precisely the same form as the declarative present tense. No other explanation is either needed or possible.

Exhibit X, D (Jn. 16:30). "You have no need that any one should ask you" is quite meaningless here. The disciples are saying, in these verses, that they are reassured; that they have full confidence in their master's wisdom, and therefore feel that they need not question him further about matters beyond their comprehension. (They are as bewildered as ever, but are touched by what he has just said to them, and wish to meet him half way.)

In the original language, the clause illustrates the freedom of the Aram. sentence, the emphasis given to a word by placing it at the end (as has been shown in several other examples in the Gospels). Our Grk. translation, though wrong, is perfectly natural.

Exhibit X, E (Jn. 19:35). This is perhaps the most important single verse in the Fourth Gospel, for here *the real author of the work* speaks momentarily, and modestly,

in his own person. He says, in effect, that all this material, from beginning to end, is derived from John the son of Zebedee, that it is really John's Gospel, and that he, the unknown disciple(?) of John, can testify to it from personal knowledge. The mysterious pronoun in the Grk. has defied interpretation, as any commentary will show. The way in which it is at once explained from the usage of Palestinian Aramaic is sufficiently set forth, with illustrative examples, in my *Four Gospels*, pp. 329 f., and need not be repeated here.

Chapter II

QUESTIONS MISUNDERSTOOD AS DECLARATIONS

THE lack of an Aram. interrogative particle is likely to cause occasional misunderstanding, since there may be nothing in the form of the sentence to distinguish a question from a declaration. (Interrogative pronouns and adverbs are of course abundant in Aram., but with their use we are not now concerned.) In many languages, as in English, the order of words is decisive, "The man is honest" being thus distinguished from "Is the man honest?" The declaration, "His neighbors can believe anything that he says," gives the reader one distinct impression of the person described; while the question, "Can his neighbors believe anything that he says?" gives an equally distinct but quite different impression. The language which has no general "question mark" puts the interpreter at a disadvantage, when he is dealing with a written text, without the help of oral delivery.

The *Hebrew* particle of interrogation is borrowed in the Aram. of Daniel, as well as throughout the Targums, but this is an artificial use; see Dalman, *Gramm.*, p. 224. In the Aram. of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim the particle never occurs. In the Eastern Aram. ("Syriac") there is the same lack, causing occasional perplexity; see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, §331. Relied upon and generally quite sufficient for the interpretation is the context, or else some general consideration. If the reader is really at a loss to know

QUESTIONS MISUNDERSTOOD AS DECLARATIONS 55

which is intended, assertion or query, the presumption is that the alternative is unimportant.

It sometimes happens in O.T. Heb. that an interrogative sentence is not provided with any interrogative word or particle. In such cases the context is supposed to leave no room for doubt, but there are some instances of resulting misunderstanding and mistranslation, more or less disturbing. The Grk. translator will ordinarily reproduce his original exactly, word for word, without undertaking to interpret; but in such passages as Is. 1:18 and (more significant) 43:23a and 24a the decision between the two varieties of sentence carries much with it. The *accidental* omission of the particle in 2 Chron. 25:8b has led to a strange mixture of readings; the rendering should be: "Would God cast you down before the enemy?"

In the Gospels there are a few minor examples of this ambiguity: question or declaration? such as might occur in any language. Lk. 11:40, for instance, has been the subject of some discussion. According to Plummer, *Comm.*, "this is almost certainly a question"; and in this decision he agrees with the Latin, as well as with the English versions: "Ye foolish ones, did not he who made the outside make also the inside?" Others have rendered: "Ye foolish ones, he who has put the outside in order has not (thereby) put in order the inside also!" (so Klost.-Gressm.). Mk. 9:11 is by some read as a question, by others as a statement of fact; the same is true of Jn. 8:25; and there are other instances.

The passages discussed in the following pages illustrate the above-mentioned defect of written Aram., the lack of an introductory particle of interrogation. The Grk. render-

ing (as in the LXX) is generally non-committal; in all such cases the interpreter, ancient or modern, makes the sentence declarative unless a question is obviously required by the context.

Exhibit XI. Questions Misunderstood as Declarations.

- A. Mk. 9:12 (Mt. 17:11) ac. to Grk.: Elijah, coming first, RESTORES all things; and how is it written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things?

True rendering: DOES Elijah, coming first, RESTORE all things? How, then, is it written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things?

- B. Mk. 14:41 f. ac. to Grk.: SLEEP ON NOW, AND TAKE YOUR REST (תִּדְמָמְךָ וְתִנָּחֶמְךָ); IT IS ENOUGH (כֵּדָה); the time has come; the Son of Man is delivered into the hands of evil men. Up, let us go; he who betrays me is at hand.

True rendering: WOULD YOU SLEEP NOW, AND TAKE YOUR REST? (same Aramaic). ALREADY (כֵּדָה) the time has come, etc.

- C. Lk. 16:8 f. ac. to Grk.: The lord of the estate PRAISED the faithless steward, because he had acted shrewdly; for the sons of this world are more sagacious, as regards their own generation, than the sons of light. And I SAY TO YOU, Gain friends for yourselves with base lucre; so that when it is gone, they may receive you into the eternal abodes. True rendering: DID the lord of the estate PRAISE the faithless steward because he had acted shrewdly (for the sons of this world are more sagacious, as regards their own

generation, than the sons of light)? and DO I SAY TO YOU, Gain friends for yourselves with base lucre, so that when it is gone you may be received into the eternal abodes?

Exhibit XI, A (Mk. 9:12; Mt. 17:11). The first clause of Jesus' answer to the disciples shows, very obviously, what they had meant by their question. The scribes of course interpreted Mal. 3:24 to mean, that Elijah, whenever he should come, would "set everything right"; that is, would prepare the mind and heart of the people of Israel for the coming of the great day. This was familiar doctrine, well known to the disciples. Jesus shows them that it is mistaken, pointing them to the past (the treatment of John) and to the future (the treatment of the Messiah). In spite of the great work that John, the forerunner, had done, the mind and heart of the people had *not* been prepared (Mt. 21:32, Lk. 7:29, etc.). The real preparation was to come later, through the work of the disciples; the scribes' interpretation of the prophecy was too sweeping.

Even so, it is perhaps conceivable, in the Marcan account, that Jesus could have been represented as at first stating the exaggerated doctrine in the form of a declaration, and then proceeding to refute it. This, however, would leave the hearer or reader in a more or less confused state of mind: did Jesus suffer the popular statement to stand, or did he not? In the form of the account given by Mt., the declarative sentence is decidedly unnatural and misleading. Wellhausen eventually recognized (*Comm.* on Mt., p. 87) that the sentence in Mk. must be understood as a question; it is perfectly evident, Mt. being also translated from Aram., that this is true in both Gospels.

It is altogether probable that the Grk. particle, *mēn*, in the

Marcan text, was introduced, by the memory of an early copyist, from the text of Mt. Von Soden edits correctly.

Exhibit XI, B (Mk. 14:41 f., Mt. 26:45). The two Grk. verbs in the first clause here translated have in recent times occasionally been interpreted as present tense rather than as imperative, making the clause a question. Thus, the Amer. edition of the English R.V. has in the margin: *Do ye sleep on, then, and take your rest?* The commentary of Klost.-Gressm. has: *Schlaft ihr nun und ruht?* These renderings are forbidden, however, by the Grk. adverb; see the comms. of Swete and Lagrange. The ancient versions could only render by the imperative; and commentators, from the earliest times, have understood the command (or rather, permission) as ironical. But irony has no place in the scene, especially after what Jesus had said in vs. 38: "the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."

The Grk. mistranslates the Aram. adverb, as in several other places; here, as in Jn. 13:19, it means simply "now"; not, as it appears to mean (and as the Grk. translators always render it), "from now on, henceforth." Accordingly, there being no indication of a question, the Grk. interpreter could see in the two Aram. verbs ("imperfect" tense, ordinarily rendered by the Grk. future) only an ironical injunction: "you may sleep *on*."

There is another false rendering in the passage; apparently the translator of Mk. was not a native Palestinian. The adverb *kaddā*, in Syriac, ordinarily means "enough," and so the Grk. renders it here. In the Palestinian dialect it always means "now, already," and in this verse it begins the second sentence. The Aram. text of Mt. differed slightly from that of Mk., reading "See, the hour is at hand

(*qirbath*)" instead of "Already the hour has come (*ēthāth*)."

Exhibit XI, C (Lk. 16:8 f.). This passage brings before us a new Jesus, one who seems inclined to compromise with evil. He approves a program of canny self-interest, recommending to his disciples a standard of life which is generally recognized as inferior: "I say to you, gain friends by means of money." This is not the worst of it; he bases the teaching on the story of a shrewd scoundrel who feathered his own nest at the expense of the man who had trusted him; and then appears to say to his disciples, Let this be your model! Commentators have exhausted their ingenuity in trying to imagine such extenuating circumstances as might permit the outraged employer to "praise" (!) the man who had habitually been false to his trust; but the parable gives no hint of such circumstances. Plummer, *Comm.*, p. 381, says very truly: "The literature on the subject is voluminous and unrepaying." No honest man of the present day would prepare his son for the practical affairs of life by reciting to him such an anecdote as this, for his guidance. The son might then show himself "wise, as regards his own generation," by stealing his father's pocket-book, in order to gain friends among his fellows. Did Jesus speak complacently of such wisdom?

The disciples are here given a lesson in faithfulness in the use of that with which they have been entrusted, a possession which will inevitably be damaged, or lost, if they make the mistake of aiming at worldly prosperity. Jesus begins the lesson with a strongly ironical parable, told with some humor. The "children of this world," if they are shrewd enough, can be shockingly unfaithful to their trust,

and yet prosper and enjoy life. The "children of light" promise themselves, quite innocently, to serve both God and mammon, but they are sadly in error. Can the friends whom they bribe guarantee them entrance into heaven? Even unfaithfulness in money matters leaves its black mark; will those who have dealt falsely with the property of others ever be trusted in the use of their own? How much more imperative is fidelity in administering the true riches!

Recent commentators, compelled by Lk.'s mistaken rendering in vss. 8 and 9, have found it necessary to detach vss. 10-13, supposing them to have been composed by Lk., or by some one else, in order to correct the unfortunate impression left by the parable. "How could Jesus, immediately after commending sharp practice, go on in the same breath to insist on faithfulness?" Sure enough, how could he?

In vs. 13, the Grk. translation makes too sharp a contrast, with its "hating" and "despising." As for the alternative intended in the verse, the one case is that of an intimate relation of affection between master and servant, the other case supposes only the ordinary toleration.

Exhibit XII. Questions Misunderstood as Declarations.

- A. Jn. 6:32 ac. to Grk.: Verily I say to you, It was NOT MOSES THAT GAVE YOU the bread from heaven; but my Father gives you the true bread from heaven.
True rendering: Verily I say to you, DID NOT MOSES GIVE you the bread from heaven? But my Father gives you the true bread from heaven.

QUESTIONS MISUNDERSTOOD AS DECLARATIONS 61

- B. Jn. 7:28 ac. to Grk.: YOU KNOW ME, AND KNOW WHENCE I AM; and I came not of myself, BUT HE WHO SENT ME IS TRUE (לָכֵן קֵשֶׁט הוּא דִּי שְׁלַחְנִי), whom you know not.
True rendering: DO YOU KNOW ME, AND KNOW WHENCE I AM? Yet I came not of myself, BUT THE TRUTH IS, THAT ONE SENT ME (same Aramaic) whom you know not.
- C. Jn. 12:7 ac. to Grk.: LET HER KEEP IT (שְׂבוּקוּדָא תִּנְטְרִינָה) for the day of my burial.
True rendering: LET HER ALONE; SHOULD SHE KEEP IT (same Aramaic) for the day of my burial?
- D. Jn. 11:49 f. ac. to Grk.: (Caiaphas said to the chief priests and Pharisees,) YOU KNOW NOTHING AT ALL; NOR DO YOU CONSIDER that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish. Probably intended: HAVE YOU NO WISDOM, AND DO YOU NOT CONSIDER that it is better for you that one man should die for the people, than that the whole nation should perish?

Exhibit XII, A (Jn. 6:32). Jesus had no reason to deny the part played by Moses in the gift of the manna, especially as his hearers had said nothing about Moses. On the contrary, by mention of him and his agency he could make clearer the contrast which he was drawing between the old dispensation and the new. Now, he would say, God is making a gift mediated by no human agent.

In the note on this passage in *The Four Gospels*, pp. 321 f., I gave abundant illustration of the favorite Aram. literary form which it exemplifies: the question, requiring an affirmative answer, followed by an assertion or argu-

ment based on the admission. It is not necessary to repeat the passages here. The clause is certainly interrogative, and the Grk., as it stands, can be thus interpreted, cf. 7:19! The Aram. sentence necessarily began with the negative particle, and a literal translator could hardly render in any other way.

Exhibit XII, B (Jn. 7:28). This is another typical example of the literary form just described; see the note on 6:32, above. Jesus could not admit for a moment, under the present circumstances (see vs. 27!), that his person and his origin were known to the people. He tells them in so many words in 8:14, 19, what he says less directly here, that they know neither him nor whence he came.

The mistranslation in the clause which follows is evident from the Aram. text. It could not interest Jesus' hearers to know whether the one who sent him was "true," or not, yet this is given central importance in our Grk. What the sentence has need to declare directly, not indirectly, is that Jesus was sent, and by one unknown to the people.

Exhibit XII, C (Jn. 12:7). How could the woman "keep" the ointment for future use, when it had already been poured out? The absurdity is of course not to be charged to the evangelist, he could not possibly have made such a blunder; as the achievement of a translator, however, it is perfectly typical. It is the same easy rendering *of words*, without attention to the clear requirement of the context, which is so constantly illustrated in the Grk. renderings from Semitic; the LXX swarms with such cases. A similar example of flat contradiction of the near context is Lk. 7:45, see the note.

Of the two possible interpretations of the Aram. text, the

true and the false, the one is as idiomatic as the other. Since there was no indication of a question, the translator (having forgotten what had been said) rendered in the more natural way.

Exhibit XII, D (Jn. 11:49 f.). It is perhaps not important to defend Caiaphas against a charge of crass insolence; it is worthy of notice, however, that the occasion was one which seemed to call for something more diplomatic than the insulting speech which our Grk. puts into the mouth of the high priest. He would at least gain nothing from speaking contemptuously of his fellows, if he wished his view to prevail. Nor is it easy to see why the evangelist should have invented the impoliteness. If the sentence is simply read as interrogative, it is obviously more effective, and more probably what the narrator intended.

Chapter III

THE REDUNDANT "AND"

IN THE Semitic usage which is here illustrated, the conjunction *wa* may be termed superfluous, inasmuch as it may always be omitted. On the other hand, in its rather widespread use it contributes a shade of meaning which can be recognized. Introducing the conclusion of a compound sentence, in a place where ordinarily no conjunction would be expected, it adds slightly to the emphasis given to the main idea. It is not quite "also." As thus employed, it appears sporadically in the Semitic languages generally; not, indeed, in Arabic, in which the conjunction *fa* serves the purpose. Hebrew, moreover, occupies a place of its own, for in its syntax the connection of clauses is looser, more primitive, and the conjunction "and" is almost omnipresent. In the dialects of Aramaic, especially in popular literature (as Brockelmann, *Compar. Gramm.*, II, 674, remarks), this peculiar use of the particle is hardly rare. If it could be rendered at all, it would be by such words as "then, so, thereupon, accordingly." There is good evidence that in Palestine, at the beginning of the present era, it was in vogue, at least in Christian usage, to a remarkable degree.

The following illustrations are taken chiefly from the Old Syriac ("Sinaitic") version of the Four Gospels. It will surprise many to see this classed as Palestinian. It must suffice here to say that the available evidence seems to indicate that the version was made, early in the second

century, by Christians who had emigrated from Palestine to the neighborhood of Antioch. While in the main it is excellent Syriac, only occasionally tinged by the Greek which it translates, yet it is so full of specifically Palestinian words, grammatical forms, and idioms, as to declare plainly the native land of the man, or men, who accomplished the task. The Curetonian Gospels are also Old Syriac (a somewhat later revision), but in these the traces of the southern dialect have generally been removed.

The late Professor Burkitt, in the very valuable discussion of the Old Syriac version in Vol. II of his *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, lists the most of the occurrences of this redundant "and" (pp. 69-73), and treats a number of them in detail. He fails, I think, to recognize their true origin, regarding their presence as a feature of the early Syriac language, and explaining their absence in the Peshitta version as due to "the later theory of Syriac syntax" (p. 70). Against this must be said, that the syntax of written Aramaic, in all the regions north and east of Palestine, was fixed many centuries before the beginning of the present era; and that its usage, as regards this conjunction, is everywhere and at all times the same which is found in the Peshitta, after due allowance has been made for the fact of translation. Nowhere, in the very many specimens of the native language known to us, is there anything even remotely resembling what we see in the "Sinaitic" Syriac, and (I should add) in the Aramaic which lies behind the Greek of our Four Gospels. On the contrary, it must be evident that in such exuberant—though hardly disturbing—use of "and" as appears constantly in such passages as Old Syr.

Mt. 9:20, 10:23, etc., there is to be recognized an easy-going retention of *Hebrew* idiom.

It is interesting to observe that the "Palestinian Syriac" (dating several centuries later than the Old Syr.) retains some traces of this hybrid usage, and that not merely in the Gospels. See Schulthess, *Gramm. des Christl.-Paläst. Aramäisch*, p. 99.

To return to the illustrations from the Sin. Syr. Gospels: an example of the "slight added emphasis" may be seen in Mt. 21:21: *If you have faith, and doubt not, you can not only do such a deed as this of the fig tree, but even if you say to this mountain, "Be taken up and cast into the sea," [and] thus it will be done.* (Cur. Syr. omits the conjunction.)

Another conditional sentence is Lk. 12:45 f.: *But if that servant shall say in his heart, "My master delays to come," and shall begin to beat the menservants and the maidservants, and to eat and drink and be drunken, [and] the master of that servant will come,* etc. (In this case, Cur. Syr. has failed to omit the conjunction.)

Compare in Heb. such passages as Gen. 31:8 and Ex. 40:37.

An example of different construction, Mt. 18:8 f.: *It is better for you that you should enter (eternal) life maimed . . . rather than that you, while having two hands or two feet, [and] should go to eternal fire.* (Likewise vs. 9): . . . *rather than that you, while having two eyes, [and] should go to the Gehenna of fire.* (Cur. Syr. is wanting here.)

The most characteristic use of the redundant "and," however, by far the oftenest illustrated, is its employment to introduce the conclusion which follows a *clause of relative*

time. Thus, for example, in the Sin. Syr. of Mt. 2:1: *Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king, [and] behold, magi came from the east to Jerusalem.* It is interesting to observe that in this verse the superfluous *wa* is found also in both Cur. and Palest. Syr. For this fact, the interjection "behold" is to be held responsible; for the phrase "*and* behold" (so very common in Heb.) is especially fixed in the usage of Old Syr. and Palest. Syr. in places where the conjunction is unnecessary.

Mk. 6:47: *When evening came, [and] the boat was in the middle of the lake, and he was alone on the land.*

Mt. 9:18: *While he was speaking with them, [and] behold, a certain ruler of their synagogue came, etc.*

Lk. 20:1: *And it happened on a certain day, while he was teaching the people in the temple and preaching the gospel, [and] there confronted him the chief priests and the scribes and the elders, etc.*

Jn. 2:23: *And while he was in Jerusalem, in the days of the feast of unleavened bread, [and] many believed on our Lord, because they saw the signs which he did for them.*

The foregoing are typical specimens. Other examples are Mt. 3:16; 12:9 and 46 (these two now in Cur. only); 18:12; 24:1; Mk. 4:6; 10:46; 11:15; Lk. 2:44; 5:17 f.; 9:58; 11:8; 13:10 ff.; 14:1 f.; 17:12; 18:4 f.; 19:1 f.; 19:36; Jn. 4:1-5 (twice); 6:19. Jn. 16:6, listed by Burkitt, is hardly to be included, for the text of the first clause appears to be conflate, deriving its unnecessary *gēr* from the Peshitta.

The treatment of the redundant "and" by the Cur. Syr. revision is interesting and significant. In general, the purpose to expunge it as a barbarism is quite evident. Cur. actually has the conjunction in six passages: Mt. 2:1 (translated

above); 3:16; 12:9, 46; Lk. 12:45 f. (translated above); 13:10 ff. The four Mt. passages are all examples of the phrase "*and* behold," mentioned above. Each of the two passages in Lk. is in a succession of four or five clauses, each introduced by "*and*"; and it is evident that the ambiguity, as to the place of beginning the conclusion, was allowed to stand. Professor Burkitt was clearly mistaken (p. 70) in supposing that Cur. had the redundant conjunction in Jn. 4:1 ff. Closer examination of the surviving fragments of the text, and comparison of the Pesh., show that the construction of the sentence in Cur. is different from that in Sin., and that the offending idiom has been corrected. Also, in the last clauses of the long interpolation in Cur. following Mt. 20:28, where Burkitt (pp. 71 f.) believed Cur. to be actually producing its own example of the idiom, the fact appears rather to be, that a copyist of the text repeated mechanically the five words in succession which appear in the corresponding sentence just above.

In all the remaining passages, twelve in number, which are preserved in both editions of the Old Syriac, the superfluous *wa* of Sin. Syr. has been corrected out of the text of Cur.; and this fact shows, plainly enough, how distasteful this un-Syriac usage was to the Curetonian revisers.

The number of occurrences of this quasi-Hebrew employment of the conjunction is very remarkable, and is unexampled elsewhere. It appears to testify to a Christian literary idiom of Palestinian Aramaic, covering only a brief period of time. Other facts, as will be seen, point in the same direction. If this is the true explanation, it is natural and most probable to suppose that we have here a genuine survival, as opposed to anything artificial. In the peculiar Syriac

which has just been discussed, and equally in the translation Grk. of the Four Gospels, the influence of O.T. Hebrew is everywhere obvious. We see the frequent employment of such idioms as the absolute infinitive; "he answered and said"; "and it came to pass" (the use of this circumlocution considerably expanded by Lk., for some stylistic reason); "he spoke (or answered), *saying*"; the employment of *nefesh* as a substitute for the reflexive pronoun; the use of "Lord" in place of "God"; the superfluous word "man" prefixed, or affixed, in apposition to a noun signifying occupation, a title, or the like (Mt. 13:28; 18:23; 20:1; 21:33; 22:2, etc.); and still others, aside from the incessant use of "*and*" at the beginning of chapters, paragraphs, and sentences.

All this may well represent the usage of a single religious community. It is to be borne in mind that the Christians of that time and land had urgent reason to preserve in their own Messianic writings whatever striking literary properties of the sacred scriptures could be retained. They saw two successive stages of a divine program, and would bridge the gap between them in every possible way. The Jews of the same period, on the contrary, in all their writings whether Aram. or Heb., studiously avoided the use of the above-mentioned and similar idioms, making the gap as wide as possible between the divine oracles and all later writings. The contrast is by no means accidental, and its significance needs no emphasis.

The remarkable use of "*and*" here described is thus characteristic of a single dialect of Palestinian Aramaic, known only in the earliest Christian scriptures. Its chief illustration is seen in the peculiar version of the Tetraevangelium

made by Palestinian Christians in the neighborhood of Antioch, and equally in the translation Greek of our Four Gospels. Since in Grk. the *redundant* use of this conjunction, in any such frequency, is unidiomatic and unpleasing, the translators of the Gospels from the original Aram. would be likely to omit it where it is evidently unnecessary. Numerous examples of it remain, nevertheless, especially in passages where a succession of "and-" clauses can create ambiguity as to the logical connection.

Exhibit XIII. The Redundant "and."

- A. Mk. 16:2-4 And very early on the first day of the week they came to the tomb. When the sun had risen, and they were saying among themselves, Who will roll for us the stone from the entrance of the tomb? [and] they looked, and saw that the stone was rolled back; and it was very great.
- B. Mt. 3:16 When Jesus had been baptized, as soon as he went up from the water, [and] behold, the heavens were opened, etc.
- C. Lk. 7:12 When he drew near to the gate of the city, [and] behold, they were bringing out a dead man.
- D. Lk. 13:25 After the master of the house has risen and made the door fast, [and] you will stand outside and knock at the door, saying, Master, open to us! and he will answer you, I know not whence you are.
- E. Jn. 1:19 f. This also is the witness of John. When the Jews sent to him from Jerusalem priests and Levites to

ask him, Who are you? [and] he replied openly; not withholding the truth, but declaring, I am not the Messiah.

- F. Jn. 20:17 Jesus said to her, Touch me not; but before I ascend to my Father, [and] go to my brethren and say to them, etc.
- G. Lk. 2:21 When the eight days were complete, for his circumcision, [and] he was given the name Jesus.
- H. Lk. 2:27 f. When the parents brought in the child Jesus, . . . [and] he took him in his arms, etc.

Exhibit XIII, A (Mk. 16:2-4). Both Mt. and Lk. declare that the women came to the tomb of Jesus while it was yet dark; and this is the time that they would naturally have chosen for their arrival. Mk., on the contrary, is made by our Grk. to say that they came *very early in the morning, after the sun had risen!* That which caused this utterly absurd saying was the presence of the redundant "and," which the Grk. translator failed to recognize. The place of beginning the conclusion of the sentence is formally ambiguous, it might be either vs. 3 or vs. 4; but the latter place, with its startling announcement, is the one which received the emphasis.

B. Mt. 3:16. It is needless to dwell on the difficulty which commentators have had with this verse. The important fact is of course not that Jesus went up "immediately" from the water, but that the heavens were opened. The two (differing) Old Syr. versions, each with its superfluous conjunction, show why the Grk. translator made a false division of clauses.

C. Lk. 7:12. Another good example of this unidiomatic

"and behold" in Luke's translation Grk. is to be seen in Acts 1:10: "And as they were looking up into heaven as he went, [and] behold, two men stood by them."

D. Lk. 13:25. Here also, as in Mk. 16:2 ff., there is ambiguity as to the place of beginning the conclusion.

E. Jn. 1:19 f. This whole passage is very awkward in the Grk. translation. The fundamental difficulty, however, lies in the "and" at the beginning of vs. 20, which can be canceled only in defiance of "the entire textual tradition" (Zahn, *Komm.*, p. 108).

F. Jn. 20:17. The words of Jesus to Mary Magdalene, as they stand in our Grk., are mystifying enough: "*Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my Father*"! We could comprehend, if he had said: "*Touch me*, for I have not yet ascended; I am still flesh and blood, as may be seen"; or on the other hand, if he had said: "*Touch me not, for I am about to ascend*, and may not be approached in the same way as before." (The Grk. "for" is the translator's interpretation of the conjunction "and," as in countless other cases.) The cause of the mistranslation was the *redundant* "and" before the all-important words "go to my brethren, and say to them," etc. The very same Aram. words would express either "before I have ascended" or "I have not yet ascended."

G. Lk. 2:21. This example and the following illustrate the use of the same redundant conjunction in *Hebrew* (for the first two chapters of Lk. are translated from that language).

H. Lk. 2:27 f. An example or two from one of the LXX translators may be added to these in Lk., by way of further illustration. Josh. 4:1: "And when all the people

had crossed over the Jordan, [and] the Lord said to Joshua," etc. Josh. 4:6 f.: "When your children ask in time to come, saying, 'What mean you by these stones?' [and] you shall say to them, It is because the waters of the Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord." Observe that in vss. 21 f., where this sentence recurs, the Grk. translator omits the superfluous conjunction.

Some of the cases listed above would ordinarily call forth no comment. The unnecessary particle is hardly noticed, especially in texts fairly bristling with "ands". In the majority of the passages cited here the reader, if disturbed at all, sees only a certain awkwardness of expression. Such cases could not be classed as mistranslations, nor are they quite "impossible" Greek. The use of this conjunction to introduce the apodosis, after a temporal protasis, has its examples in Homer, for instance. Nevertheless the presence of a strange idiom in the Gospels is unmistakable in view of the evidence here presented, and in several passages its recognition clears away a serious difficulty. Here, obviously and beyond all question, is the explanation of the *absurdity* in Mk. 16:2, now completely removed, and removable in no other way. The misunderstanding which resulted in putting into the mouth of Jesus an impossible saying in Jn. 20:17 is fully explained. In each of the two passages the Grk. is certainly the result of mistranslation of an Aram. text. In Jn. 1:19 f. perfect clearness is substituted for intolerable confusion. The other cases are chiefly important as examples of the idiom.

Chapter IV

THE REFLEXIVE PRONOUN AND ITS SUBSTITUTE

IN THE Aram. dialects, as in classical Hebrew, the personal pronoun in the oblique cases may serve as reflexive. This is unusual, however, except in the case of the "ethical dative" (see below). Ordinarily a noun which in English would be rendered "self" is employed. As a substitute for the pronoun in this sense the word *nafs*, *nefesh*, "life, soul" (less commonly *rūāch*) is widely used in Semitic. This is familiar in the Heb. Bible, and its use seems to have been common to all the Aram. dialects at the beginning of the present era. In the Palmyrene and Nabatean inscriptions, the writing of Palestine's nearest neighbors, the examples are numerous.

As was remarked in the preceding chapter, the later Jewish writings avoided the use of this Biblical term; and another was adopted in its place, the word "bone" (collective singular) being almost exclusively employed. If one wished to say, for instance, "Prepare yourself" (for this or that), the ordinary later phrase, in either Aram. or Heb., would be, "Prepare your *bones*." Thus also in Palest. Syr., but not in the Old Syr. In the original Aram. of the Four Gospels, as would be expected (see the preceding chapter), the word *nefesh* is everywhere retained. This appears distinctly in such passages as Lk. 9:25 (see below) and 14:26, where Wellh. and Klosterm.-Gressm. correctly render "sich selbst." It is evident that Grk. translators would occasionally

write "soul" or "life" where "self" was originally intended, and *vice versa*. Examples will be given in the sequel.

Very frequent in Aram. is the so-called "ethical dative," the idiom in which the modification of a verb by a reflexive (personal) pronoun attached to the preposition *lē-* is so slight as to be untranslatable. This is rather frequent in Biblical Heb., but it is especially the Aram. language that constantly expands "he went away" into "he went away *for himself*"; "we know" into "we know *for ourselves*"; similarly, "they wondered *for themselves*" (or, "*in themselves*"); "they questioned *for themselves*," and so on, with almost any verb. The translator, of course familiar with the idiom, would be likely to leave it untranslated; it frequently happens, nevertheless, that from the wish to omit no intended emphasis, or (more often) simply because of the habit of rendering whatever stands in the text, the idiom reappears in the Grk.

Exhibit XIV. The Reflexive Pronoun, etc.

- A. Lk. 9:25 ac. to Grk.: What is a man profited, if he gains the whole world, but loses HIMSELF (נפשו)?
True rendering: . . . but loses HIS LIFE (same word)?
- B. Jn. 13:32 Emended Grk.: Already the Son of Man has been glorified, and God has been glorified in him; and soon he will glorify Him IN HIMSELF (בנפשו).
Probably intended: . . . and soon he will glorify Him WITH HIS LIFE (same word).
Examples of the "ethical dative":
- C. Mk. 6:31 He said to them, Come [*for yourselves*, לכון] away to a desert place, and take a little rest.

- d. Mt. 23:9 And call [*for yourselves*] no man on earth Abba; for there is for you one Abba, he who is in heaven.
- e. Lk. 7:30 All the common people and the publicans who gave heed justified God, in receiving John's baptism; but the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected [*for themselves*] the divine plan, not being baptized by him.
- f. Lk. 18:11 The Pharisee stood [*for himself*] and prayed thus: God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are.
- g. Jn. 11:33 When Jesus saw her weeping, . . . he was deeply distressed and shaken [*for himself*, ܐܢܐ ܝܥܝܢ].
- h. Jn. 20:10 (cf. Lk. 24:12) So the disciples went away [*for themselves*] again.

Exhibit XIV, A (Lk. 9:25; Mk. 8:36, Mt. 16:26). We have here a characteristic example of Lk.'s manner of translating, as well as of the ambiguity residing in the word which he renders. The passage has already been described as a mistranslation (Exhibit VI, A), and further consideration of it was reserved for this place. It was shown, from the parallel passages in Mk. and Mt. and also from the context here in Lk., that "lose himself" is wrong; what the man is supposed to lose is *his life*. The regular use of Aram. *nēfesh*, "life," as a substitute for the reflexive pronoun (as just described) of course explains the false rendering, but there is also another factor to be taken into account. In the former treatment of the passage, Lk.'s remarkably mechanical and exact way of translating *words* was mentioned.²⁵ One interesting feature of his habit may be illustrated here.

²⁵ There are many striking examples, aside from those which happen to receive mention in *The Four Gospels* and in the present volume. One typical

In a passage which contains more than once a word capable of two different renderings, Lk.'s meticulous method sometimes leads him to include both. An example is the "forgive us our trespasses," etc., in the Lord's Prayer. On the first occurrence of the term, Lk. renders "sins" (11:4), and then, in the same verse, "debtor." In 13:2, 4, he does the same thing: the Galileans were "sinners," the men of Siloam were "debtors" (!); and thus both uses of the word are covered. In the present passage the proceeding is the same. "Life" had already been used, to render the Aram. word; now, the other possibility is included.

A mistake (wrong choice) in the other direction is to be seen in 14:26, where (as was remarked above) the rendering evidently should be "himself," instead of "his life." This particular mistranslation has its perfect parallels in the LXX; good examples are Deut. 4:15 (cf. Josh. 23:11!), Jer. 3:11, and Job 9:21. In these and similar passages the sense is merely reflexive, but the Grk., too literal, brings in the "soul." Another instructive instance is Prov. 15:32 (Grk. 16:3).

Exhibit XIV, B (Jn. 13:32). Our Grk. text of this verse is overloaded and confusing. In *The Four Gospels*, p. 326, the explanation was offered, that because of an early and easy copyist's mistake the second half of the verse was made to read: [*and God will glorify him in himself,*] *and*

specimen may be added here. Concerning the curious *καυρῶ* in 20:10, Wellhausen, *Comm.*, remarks, that it "cannot mean, and yet must mean, 'at the proper time'." How could Lk., who certainly knew how to write Greek, make such a blunder? It is no blunder (though it is not Greek at all), but is merely his usual proceeding. Like the many other specimens of hybrid and inelegant Grk. written by him, it is the result of strictly accurate translation according to his norm. The explanation is perfect here, as it generally is. The above-mentioned Grk. word renders *exactly* the Aram. adverbial compound, *li-zman*, which stood in his text. The same word, in a precisely similar context, occurs in Gen. 18:14, Targ. Onk.: "*At the set time I will return.*"

straightway he will glorify him in himself"; the clause in brackets being the result of the error, and therefore to be omitted.

I believe that we have here a capital example of the fourth evangelist's cryptic expression. The words of Jesus were intended as the announcement that now, very soon, he was to glorify the Father by the supreme act of *yielding up his life*. The idiom is precisely that which we see in 1 Kings 2:23, the preposition *beth* denoting the price, as so often elsewhere: "Adonijah said these things *at the cost of his life* (*bē-nafshō*)." No one who heard the words of Jesus at that time could have seen their true meaning (cf. Exhibit IX, A), nor would any translator be likely to render otherwise than "in himself."

Exhibit XIV, C (Mk. 6:31). Jesus says to his disciples, "Come away for a little while, to a quiet place." The emphatic "you yourselves" in our Grk. has no justification; the Lat., the Old Syr., and Cod. Bezae all omit these superfluous words, the translators recognizing the "ethical dative" construction, which the Peshitta actually restores. The Grk. versions of the O.T. frequently show the attempt to reproduce the redundant pronoun, and students of this passage in Mk. should compare the LXX readings in Deut. 1:7, 13; 2:13; 5:30 (Heb. 5:27), which are perfectly parallel (come *you*; return *you*; etc.). Other good examples are Josh. 18:4, Judg. 20:7, 2 Sam. 2:21, Is. 2:22 (Aquila), and the Lat. *sibi* at the end of Job 12:11. All of the O.T. passages cited here are listed in Heb. grammars as examples of the pronoun which should *not* be translated; and it is to be borne in mind that the construction is much more common in Aram. than in Heb.

The proposed emendation of Mk. 6:20—see a subsequent Exhibit—would furnish a characteristic specimen. Another is in Jn. 7:8, as emended; see Exhibit XXII, D. More or less doubtful as examples, but deserving mention especially in view of the great frequency of the idiom, are Mk. 1:27; 9:10 (in spite of vs. 14); 14:4 (see the Syr. versions and Cod. Bezae).

Exhibit XIV, D (Mt. 23:9). Jesus would keep the term *Abbā*, "the father," for the Father in heaven; cf. Mk. 14:36, Rom. 8:15, Gal. 4:6; no other meaning of the verse in Mt. is possible. The Grk. makes nonsense with its mis-translation. Old Syr., Peshitta, Palest. Syr., and Cod. Bezae all recognize the "ethical dative"; the genitive "your" in the Grk. is the usual attempt (described above) to reproduce the redundant pronoun.

Exhibit XIV, E (Lk. 7:30). The Aram. idiom is here quite certain, the words "for themselves" being worse than useless in this context. Wellhausen's perplexed comment (*Evang. Lucae*, p. 30) is remarkable, the idiom is so obviously Semitic. But no Grk. writer "thinking in Aramaic" would ever have produced the phrase.

Exhibit XIV, F (Lk. 18:11). In this case, there seems to be a shade of humor, or irony, in the use of the idiom, the redundant pronoun making the action of the Pharisee, in taking the attitude, a little more conspicuous. It is not simply "he stood and prayed," but rather, "he took his stand, and prayed."

"He stood by himself" (as the most of the ancient versions render, in their attempt to do justice to the Grk.) is weak, and without obvious motive. The publican was the one who stood by himself.

Exhibit XIV, G (Jn. 11:33). The origin of the curious phrase in the Grk., "he distressed himself," is plain to see. There is strong probability that the Aram. verb conjectured in the Exhibit is the one which was used by the evangelist.

1. In the Targums it often has this meaning of distressed agitation (*The Four Gospels*, p. 324).
2. It frequently corresponds in the Targums to the Grk. verb (LXX) which is employed here in Jn.
3. The Peshitta renders with it here.
4. It is commonly used—also in Syr.—with an "ethical dative."

Exhibit XIV, H (Jn. 20:10; cf. Lk. 24:12). No use of the superfluous reflexive pronoun is more common in Aram. than this: *āzal lēh*, "he went away"; *āzalū lēhōn*, "they went away." The Grk. merely renders this idiom, too literally, in each of the above-named passages.

As for Lk. 24:12, so generally omitted by modern critics as a later addition, I find myself in full agreement with the excellent remarks of Lagrange, *Évangile selon St. Luc*, pp. 601 f. He argues forcibly, that Lk. did not derive this vs. from Jn., while on the other hand the correspondence in the Grk. of the two accounts seems to show literary dependence, viz. that of Jn. on Lk. Agreeing to this, I should nevertheless question whether the evangelist himself was acquainted with the Third Gospel.

The Galilean version, represented by Mk. and Mt., knew nothing of a visit of Peter to the tomb of Jesus. But the source of Lk.'s account of the Passion, as I have argued elsewhere (see the next chapter, and *The Four Gospels*, p. 263), was a Judean document, which Lk. translated. The Fourth Gospel was also Judean. The story of Peter's visit

to the tomb was current, I believe, in Judean Aram., in about the form given in Lk. We see in Jn. a characteristic expansion, of which the details, first in the original language and then in the Grk. translation, need not be considered here.

Chapter V

LUKE AND THE PALESTINIAN DIALECT

It is generally taken for granted, and with very good reason, that the author of the Third Gospel was a Gentile by birth, and that Palestine was not his native land. Interesting confirmation of the latter belief is given by the two works of translation which we have from his hand: the Gospel, and Acts 1:1-15:35.

In our Grk. text of the two documents, certain words are used in a manner that suggests misunderstanding of some sort. Taken in their usual meaning, they yield a sense which is either incongruous with their context or else inadmissible on general grounds. In Lk. 2:1, a tax on "all the *world*" is mentioned; though it is evident, as commentators agree, that only Palestine is intended. Similarly, in Acts 11:28 a famine extending "over the whole *world*" is shown, by the account which follows, to have affected merely "all Palestine"; at least, the brethren in Syria were not affected by it, but could send relief to the community in Judea.

The Grk. word for "city" appears several times in contexts where it is out of place. It stands for *province*, or *district*, in Lk. 1:39, unquestionably; and in 8:39, judging from probability and from the close parallel in Mk. In 8:28 and 9:10, on the contrary, it is used where the context requires the meaning *uninhabited region*! In the foregoing examples, the fact that each peculiar use is repeated shows that it is deliberate, not the result of any accident. We seem to see,

at these several points, an ill-fitting terminology; how account for it?

In each and all of these cases it is immediately obvious, to any student of Aramaic who suspects the Greek of being the result of translation, that Lk.'s Grk. renders exactly *according to Gentile usage* Aram. words which in the usage peculiar to Palestine have precisely the meaning required by the sense in their several passages, but missed by Lk. Thus, Gentile Aram. had two words regularly and constantly used for "city," namely *medīnā* (lit., "region under jurisdiction") and *qiryā* (orig., "place where hospitality may be found"). In the Palestinian usage, the former word had invariably the meaning "district, province." The latter word, while capable of signifying every degree of human population from capital city to isolated farmhouse, was in Palestine much used in very nearly its primitive sense, to designate the open country adjoining a city or town (exactly as in 8:28 and 9:10!).

As for the confusion of Palestine with "the world," no one who is acquainted with Hebrew-Jewish usage can fail to see the explanation of Lk.'s Grk. The same word which means "the earth" and "the world" means also "*the land*." But no Gentile would ever render *kol 'ar'ā* in any other way than by "all the world."

Lk. translated texts written in the holy land, and he rendered them as an outsider. The examples given here tell a plain story, and there are others to add to them, as will be seen. Note the struggle with a Palestinian idiom in 6:40—if a mechanically word-for-word rendering can be held to give evidence of a struggle. Especially worthy of notice is the recurrence in "I Acts" of two of the mistakes of this

nature (the very same words misunderstood) which are seen in the Third Gospel.

The following "Exhibit" is very significant. Here are *seven* examples of mistranslation, some of them producing mere nonsense, which have one and the same very natural explanation: the fact of usage characteristic of Palestinian Aram., well known today to students of the language, but not belonging to the native speech of Luke the Gentile. The examples of this kind represent all parts of the Gospel, from the two Hebrew chapters at the beginning to the account of the Passion. Lk. is translating, in his characteristic manner, a succession of documents, that is certain, and his material is all Palestinian. There is also evidence that a part of it is specifically Judean, as will appear.

Exhibit XV. Luke and the Palestinian Dialect.

- A. Lk. 1:39 ac. to Grk.: In those days Mary arose and went with haste into the hill country, to THE CITY JUDAH (מְדִינַת יְהוּדָה).
True rendering: . . . to THE PROVINCE OF JUDEA (same words).
- B. Lk. 8:39 (cf. Mk. 5:20) ac. to Grk.: He proclaimed through the whole city what Jesus had done for him.
True rendering: . . . the whole PROVINCE (same Heb. word).
- C. Lk. 2:1 ac. to Grk.: In those days there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that ALL THE WORLD (כָּל הָאָרֶץ) should be enrolled (cf. Acts 11:28).
True rendering: . . . ALL THE LAND (of Israel).

- D. Lk. 6:40 (Mt. 10:25) ac. to Grk.: The disciple is not above his teacher; but every one WHEN HE IS PERFECTED (יִתְקַיֵּן) shall be as his teacher.
True rendering: FITTING (same word) it is that every one should be as his teacher.
- E. Lk. 8:27 ac. to Grk.: . . . a man from THE CITY (קִרְיָתָא).
True rendering: . . . from THE OPEN COUNTRY (same word).
- F. Lk. 9:10 ac. to Grk.: . . . to the CITY (called) Bethsaida.
True rendering: to the OPEN COUNTRY of Bethsaida.
- G. Lk. 17:22 ac. to Grk.: Days will come, when you will desire to see ONE OF THE DAYS (אֶחָד מִיָּמֵי) of the Son of Man.
True rendering: . . . desire GREATLY to see OF THE DAYS (same words), etc.

Exhibit XV, A (Lk. 1:39). The Grk. of this verse has given much trouble to exegetes. It contains a riddle which is insoluble for all those who refuse to see that Lk.'s curious Grk. (curious not merely in this verse, but throughout the Gospel) is the result of translation. There was no "city Judah," and the rendering "a city of Judah" (English R.V.) is grammatically impossible; for in order to express this, the genitive case of the proper name must be shown, as in vs. 65, Jn. 4:5, etc. Lk. regarded "Judah" as the name of a city, as is quite evident from his Grk. in 2:4.

The obvious explanation of Lk.'s mistake was given by me first in 1909, and has been repeated several times since. The references are given most fully, and the whole subject is treated most completely, in the *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XVII (1924), pp. 83-89. The main facts there fully

established and illustrated are (p. 84): "In Hebrew and Jewish-Aramaic writings, from the earliest attested use of the word down through the first few centuries after Christ, *medina* has the meaning 'province'; in the Gentile usage it always and everywhere means 'city'." Lk. was a Gentile, and he rendered accordingly. He makes the same mistake again in 8:39, see below.

Mary, journeying from Galilee, went up through "the hill country" to the province of Judea; so the route is elsewhere described. Thus in Judith 4:6 f. the high priest in Jerusalem calls upon the people of Shechem and Samaria "to hold the passes *into the hill country*, because through them was *the entrance into Judea*." When Mary's husband Joseph makes the same journey, a little later (2:4), he goes up from Nazareth "into Judea." It is perfectly evident that Lk. mistranslated, and we know why he did so.

As to the nature of the evidence which this particular mistranslation affords, I may quote from a letter which I received many years ago from the late Professor F. C. Burkitt. The letter is dated at Westroad Corner, Cambridge, Dec. 30, 1912, and contains the following (referring to my "Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels"):

"In some points, indeed, you have made a convert of me; your argument on Lk. i 39 *εἰς πόλιν Ἰουδα* does seem convincing. And further, a phrase like *מדינת יהודה* is a *literary* phrase; Luke must therefore have been using a document, not a tale told by word of mouth." As is well known, Burkitt later rejected all theories of translation from Hebrew or Aramaic, whether of the first half of Acts or of any Gospel.

Exhibit XV, B (Lk. 8:39; cf. Mk. 5:20). "He *went*

away through the whole city, proclaiming," etc., is less impressive than it sounds. "He proclaimed in the city" would say as much. The parallel account in Mk. says that the man "went away" through *the whole district* (the Decapolis), telling the marvelous story. It is plain—especially in view of the passage just discussed—that Lk.'s Aram. contained the word *medina*, which he rendered "city," as usual.

Exhibit XV, C (Lk. 2:1; cf. Acts 11:28). "*The land*," for any Jewish writer, was the standing designation of the land of Israel, Palestine; and that, unquestionably, was the meaning of Lk.'s Hebrew in this passage. The usage was of course utterly foreign to any Gentile writer, to whom the phrase would always mean "the earth, the world." A most significant parallel to the present passage, adding testimony which should by no means be overlooked, is Acts 11:28, where Lk., translating this time from Aramaic, makes a Palestinian famine, which did not reach even to Antioch (vs. 30), cover the whole inhabited earth. So any Gentile would have rendered.

Exhibit XV, D (Lk. 6:40; cf. Mt. 10:25). This is a noteworthy example of too-literal, awkward translation, mainly occasioned by unfamiliarity with the dialect of the original. In Mt. the clause reads: "It is *enough* for the disciple that he should be as his teacher." Lk.'s original said the same, using a different adjective. In Jewish Aram. the word *taqqin* is frequently used to mean "fitting, good, right," in such sentences as the following: "It is not *good* that the man should be alone" (Gen. 2:18); "Do to her what seems *right* to you" (16:6); "It is not *meet* so to do," etc.; these examples from the Targum. In the Gentile Aram. usage, on the contrary, the word has only the meaning of

the passive participle, "fitted, prepared, ordered," etc.; it is not used at all in the way just illustrated.

Lk.'s Aram. read: *taqqīn kol lehēwē kē-mallēfānēh*, "fit-ting (it is, that) every one should be as his teacher." The concise expression, omitting the conjunction, is idiomatic, as in Syr. (Nöldeke, §368), and would be likely in such a sententious utterance as this. Lk., the Gentile, rendered: "fitted, every one shall be as his teacher"; which, viewed as Greek, is at least not pleasing, nor does it make acceptable sense.

Exhibit XV, E (Lk. 8:27; cf. Mk. 5:2 ff., Mt. 8:28). The maniac did not come "from the city," he came from the tombs in the outlying country. We know this not only from Mk. 5:2 and Mt. 8:28 but also from Lk.'s own account. The man was wild and dangerous; he wore no clothes and dwelt in no house; the attempt had often been made to catch and secure him, but he always broke away and fled to his abode in the tombs (vs. 27), in the uninhabited country (vs. 29).²⁸

Yet Lk. could write, "a man from the city"(!), and the reason for his doing so is evident. He saw before him the word *qiryēthā*, and rendered it according to its principal meaning in all varieties of Aram. In Palestine, however, the word had a remarkable range of meaning in both popular

²⁸ It seems very probable that the similarity of the ending of vs. 29 to that of vs. 27 accounts for the strange position of the long parenthesis (!), vs. 29b, which, judging from the parallels, especially Mk. 5:3b, 4, and also from literary considerations, would be expected to follow immediately after vs. 27. It is not merely the case that each of the two verses ends with the abode of the demoniac; there was also in the Aram. text such a graphic resemblance as has caused a multitude of similar transpositions. Vs. 27 ended with *qabraiyā*, vs. 29 with *dabraiyā* (or *madbraiyā*), plural. The eye of the copyist, who had just written vs. 27, caught the latter word, and he went on with what originally had followed vs. 29; but at once saw his mistake, and introduced the overlooked passage; the usual proceeding in such cases. See p. 125.

and literary usage. It is "city, village, hamlet, farm, open country," as any lexicon will show. It would never be employed in speaking of the barren or mountainous desert, but only of regions where the land is generally under cultivation. It very frequently designates *the uninhabited part of an inhabited district*, or the "country" as opposed to the town. This fact at once explains Lk.'s mistranslation here, as also the same error in 9:10; see below.

Exhibit XV, F (Lk. 9:10-12). There is an absurd contradiction here. Jesus invites his nearest disciples to come with him to a quiet place in the country (Mk. 6:31 f., Mt. 14:13), for a brief rest. They do so, but the curious crowd follows them. The chosen place is indeed "desert," utterly uninhabited (Lk. vs. 12), but according to vs. 10 it is "the city Bethsaida"!

The explanation is the same which has just been given for the absurdity in 8:27; see above. Lk.'s Aram. text had *qiryēthā dī B.*, and he rendered: "the city which is (called) Bethsaida"; whereas the rendering should have been, "the open country belonging to Bethsaida."

Exhibit XV, G (Lk. 17:22). "One of the days" is not plausible, and the commentators all have their trouble with the phrase. Simply "the days" would be better, for that which the disciples will long to see is the second coming, the Messianic time, as the following context shows. Still more forcible is the phrase which the Aram. original actually used: "You will *greatly* desire" to see that time.

The word which Lk. misunderstood belongs specifically to the dialect of Judea (Dalman, *Gramm.*, p. 211), and thus gives evidence that Lk.'s account of the last days of Jesus in Jerusalem, and of his passion, came from a Judean docu-

ment. The word, *lachdā*, is an adverb, made up from the preposition, the numeral "one," and the feminine ending, and the original meaning was "uniquely." It is very much used in Judean Aram. I discussed the word and its use at length in my *Composition and Date of Acts*, pp. 10-14, showing that Luke misunderstood it in Acts 2:47, at the end of the verse, where the rendering should be: "the Lord added *greatly* day by day to the saved"; there is no other plausible way of translating the clause.

In the Gospel, Lk.'s text seemed to contain the numeral "one" as the direct object of the verb (which, as often, stood at the end of the clause), with a quite regular use of the preposition; cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.* §288, C. Here, as in the passage in Acts, the Judean adverb was not recognized. The use of *min*, "to see *of* the days," is like that in Is. 53:11 (Heb.) and in many other places, usage especially common in Aramaic.

Chapter VI

WRONG VOCALIZATION OF THE ARAMAIC

BECAUSE of the structure of Semitic words, built as they are on roots consisting of two or three consonants, the vowels, which chiefly indicate the various modifications of the root idea, are especially important. They were not indicated in the writing; the reader was supposed to recognize the right pronunciation, as he generally could. There was inevitable ambiguity, however, especially in any rapid reading, copying, or translating. Typical verb forms might easily be confused, if the context seemed to leave the choice open. Thus, in numerous instances, the question between past time (the perfect tense) and future time (the active participle, having exactly the same consonants), or between active and passive participles of derived items. Did the evangelist (Jn. 17:14) say: "the world *has hated* the disciples"? or, "the world *will hate* them"? Was "every man *brought violently* into the kingdom of heaven" (Lk. 16:16)? or did "every man *treat it with violence*"?

Forms containing the long vowels, *ū* and *ī*, were often written "defectively," with occasional ambiguity as the result. This orthography was frequent in all ordinary writings; there are many cases, of every variety, in Biblical Aram.; and the same thing appears even in the copies of official documents (Hebrew) written on ostraca, recently discovered at Lachish. Thus the active and passive of the first stem were sometimes confused, as in Mk. 6:14 ("the

miracles *are wrought* by him"); the disciple is exhorted (Mt. 5:48) to be "all-including" (*gāmar*) in his good will toward men, not to be "perfect" (*gēmīr*). In Lk. 8:29, the phrase *āchīdh bēh* did not mean (as in our Grk.) "it (the demon) seized him," but rather, "he (the demoniac) was seized"; the word having either active or passive signification, according to the context; see J.B.L., vol. 54, p. 21, below.

Further ambiguity appears in words of very different meaning which are written in identical form. Especially clear examples of this confusion are to be seen in Lk. 11:41 and 48 (Exhibit XVII, E, F). The translator's habit, constantly illustrated in the LXX, of choosing the word *usually* indicated by the group of letters before him is well shown in Jn. 6:21: the disciples "wished" to receive Jesus into the boat, instead of "rejoiced" to receive him.

The mutual resemblance of certain letters, in either form of Aram. script, has caused a few mistakes in the Gospels, as it has caused very many in the O.T. The fact that *daleth* and *resh* were written exactly alike, combined with a somewhat unusual order of words in the Aram. clause, led to the amusing mistranslation in Mk. 7:3. The same fact, combined with "defective" writing of a long vowel, brought about the Grk. rendering in Lk. 24:32. In at least one instance there is confusion of *daleth* and *waw*, which could easily take place, under the right conditions, in either the square character or the cursive. The passage is Jn. 5:34, here included (Exhibit XXII, C) among the cases of corruption of the consonant text. Quite probably, however, the error was merely the result of the Grk. translator's misreading. The character in question might well be written in such a

way that only the author of the sentence could tell which consonant was intended, in view of the "defective" writing of the final long vowel.

The most striking illustration of the mischief that can be wrought by a falsely placed vowel is afforded by Jn. 7:38, where we are told that "the scripture hath said," etc. Now, at last, we know *what* was said. Jesus quotes a familiar prophecy, variously uttered in four different books of the Bible. The substance of the prophecy, given in the fewest possible words, is what we now read in the corrected Johanne verse; and the change from mere nonsense is effected by a vowel point under a single letter. Moreover, the wording in Jn. shows with certainty *which* of the four O.T. passages was especially in mind.

Exhibit XVI. Wrong Vocalization of the Aramaic.

- A. Mk. 7:3 ac. to Grk.: The Jews do not eat without washing their hands WITH THE FIST (לְגִמְרָה).
True rendering: The Jews do not eat AT ALL (לְגִמְרָה) without washing their hands.
- B. Mk. 10:12 (Lk. 16:18) ac. to Grk.: She who DIVORCES HER HUSBAND (פְּטָרָא לְבַעְלָהּ).
True rendering: She who is DIVORCED BY HER HUSBAND (פְּטָרָא לְבַעְלָהּ).
- C. Mk. 14:3, Mt. 26:6 ac. to Grk.: Simon THE LEPER (סִימֹן הַלֵּפֶר).
True rendering: Simon THE JAR MERCHANT (סִימֹן הַכֵּימָר).
- D. Mt. 5:48 ac. to Grk.: Be therefore PERFECT (גִּמְרִין), even as your heavenly Father is PERFECT (גִּמְרָה).

True rendering: Be therefore ALL-INCLUDING (ܐܡܪܝܢ) (in your good will), even as your heavenly Father INCLUDES ALL (ܐܡܪ).

- E. Mt. 8:9, Lk. 7:8 ac. to Grk.: For I also am a man APPOINTED (ܡܦܩܕ) under authority, WHO HAVE UNDER ME (ܕܝ ܐܬܝ ܠܝ) soldiers; and I say to this one, etc.

True rendering: For I am a man APPOINTING (ܡܦܩܕ) soldiers under the authority WHICH I HAVE (same words); and I say, etc.

- F. Mt. 10:2 ac. to Grk.: These are the names of the twelve APOSTLES: THE FIRST, SIMON (ܫܡܥܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܫܡܥܘܢ), etc.

True rendering: These are the names of THE FIRST twelve APOSTLES: SIMON (ܫܡܥܘܢ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܫܡܥܘܢ), etc.

Exhibit XVI, A (Mk. 7:3). The amusing slip of the Grk. translator has brought forth numerous curious conjectures and interpretations; see Swete's *Gospel ac. to St. Mark*. It is worthy of especial notice that the Syr. translators knew that something was seriously wrong, and left out the impossible "fist" altogether. The Lat. refused to translate the word, and substituted something else. The Aram. word conjectured above corresponds exactly to the Grk., and is obviously the original reading. The emphatic position of the word: "at all do not eat" (like Lat. *omnino non*), immediately after the word "hands," misled the translator. See further the note in the *Four Gospels*.

Exhibit XVI, B (Mk. 10:12; cf. Mt. 5:32, Lk. 16:18). One of the clearest examples of mistaken Grk. rendering, shown as such not only by the retroversion into Aram., but also by the perfect parallels in Mt. and Lk. Jesus is speaking of formal divorce (vss. 2-5), not of desertion, and he uses

the technical term. It is well known that the Jewish law of the time did not permit the wife to divorce her husband (Josephus, *Antt.* xv, 7, 10). The Grk. text of Mk. is certainly wrong, while that of the two parallel passages is correct. The translator quite naturally took the participle as *active*, as it had been in the preceding verse; but the *passive*, written with the same consonants, was the true reading. There is abundant evidence that the scribes of the Aram. Gospels were sparing in their use of the vowel letters; these were literary works, not business or legal documents. It could not have occurred to the author, or to his copyists, that any Palestinian reader could fail to read the phrase rightly. The preposition *l'* would indicate the direct object after the active participle, but the agent after the passive. And finally, it must not be overlooked that Lk. 16:18, last clause, gives an exact verbal rendering of the Aram. here conjectured for Mk.!

This saying of Jesus was so important (his only real contradiction of the Mosaic law), and so productive of controversy, that we should expect it to have been preserved with little or no variation; and this in fact is what we do find, see especially the note on Mt. 5:32 (Exhibit III, B).

Littmann, *l.c.*, p. 26 f., is right in preferring *ba'l* to *gēbar* in this passage, even though the latter word is generally used for "husband" in the Targum to Deut. 24:1-5, the passage dealing with divorce. When the suffix ("her husband") is used, the word *ba'l* is the one employed. Littmann queries whether this Aramaic use of the word "man" to mean "husband" was derived from the Greek. The fact is, that it merely reproduces the *Hebrew* usage. Observe nevertheless the Targ. to Gen. 3:6.

Exhibit XVI, C (Mk. 14:3; Mt. 26:6). Since "Simon the leper" and "Simon the jar merchant" are written with the same Aram. consonants, the choice between the two seems easy, in view of the nature of leprosy, and the known Jewish laws and customs. The word *g'rāb*, "jar," was in constant household use all through Palestine; there must have been enterprising tradesmen (not *makers* of jars) who bought at wholesale and supplied the ever-lively market; and the *only* way of forming the word "jar merchant" is the one presented here. Littmann, *l.c.*, p. 32, thinks of the word "potter"; but that is a different occupation. Mt. of course adopts Mk.'s rendering.

Exhibit XVI, D (Mt. 5:48). The trouble with this verse lies not only in the absurd command to equal divine perfection, but also in the way in which it ignores, in effect, the preceding context, while professing to be based on it. "Be *therefore* perfect"; whereas the foregoing verses had enjoined imitation of God in showing kindness and good will to all men, even to enemies. "Be perfect in kindness" would be a suitable conclusion; but the Grk. adjective has its own definite meaning, and could not be interpreted in this way. The conjectured Aram. participle satisfies the sense, and explains the Grk.

Exhibit XVI, E (Mt. 8:9; Lk. 7:8). The Grk. is strangely awkward and ambiguous; see the comments of Blass (in Klostermann), Allen, Wellhausen (who suspects mistranslation!), Klostermann-Gressmann, and others. The first clause of the centurion's utterance in this verse is at least superfluous, for its bearing is neither indicated nor apparent. It seems to say: *For I also, like you, am subject to*

authority—which cannot possibly have been intended. Attempts have been made to emend the Grk. by conjecture.

The solution proposed in *The Four Gospels* is certainly possible; Littmann, *l.c.*, 31 f., says a good word for it; but, though on the right track, it has not quite satisfied me. It fails to do justice to Lk.'s participle *τασσομενος*, which can hardly have been his rendering of the colorless Aram. word which I had conjectured; it looks rather like a technical term. (This participle was probably not originally present in Mt.'s Grk., but it must have been in his Aram.; see below.) Again, even after the improvement in the first clause, the sentence, with its loose construction and the repeated word, "under," remained unconvincing.

It now appears that the prime source of the confusion was that everlasting trouble-maker, the Aram. particle *dī*. The phrase *dī ūthai lī*, referred to the *following* word, would mean: "who have under me soldiers"; referred to the *preceding* word, it means: "the authority *which* I have," or "the command which I hold." Either construction is regular, and good style. It is obvious, from the order of the sentence, that the easier mode of rendering is the one which was employed. Since Lk.'s Aram. text was substantially, or exactly, like Mt.'s, he adopted Mt.'s Grk. throughout, as usual, except for the participle mentioned above. The translator of the First Gospel was one who might be expected to omit the superfluous word in the phrase "ordered under authority," while Lk., the meticulous translator, would be certain to render it.

Exhibit XVI, F (Mt. 10:2). Peter was not the first apostle, his call did not precede that of Andrew. No evangelist would have given him the first *rank*, in view of Mk. 10:44, Mt. 20:27, Lk. 22:26; but a Grk. translator might

easily do so, deceived by the Aram., in which the adjective could be read as either singular or plural number. At the time when this Gospel was composed, the long-familiar list of the "twelve" contained the name Matthias (Acts 1:26); hence Mt. saw fit to use the adjective: "the *first* twelve."

Exhibit XVII. Wrong Vocalization of the Aramaic.

- A. Mk. 6:14; Mt. 14:2 ac. to Grk.: John the Baptist has risen from the dead, and therefore THE POWERS(!) WORK IN HIM (חֵילָא עֲבַדִּין בֵּהּ).
True rendering: . . . and therefore THE WONDERS ARE WROUGHT THROUGH HIM (חֵילָא עֲבַדִּין בֵּהּ).
- B. Lk. 7:45 ac. to Grk.: Since the time when I CAME IN (עֲלֵח).
True rendering: Since the time when SHE CAME IN (עֲלֵח).
- C. Lk. 7:47 ac. to Grk.: Therefore I say to you, THAT HER many sins are forgiven (דִּי מִשְׁתַּבֵּק לָהּ חַטֵּיָה רַבָּא), FOR SHE LOVED MUCH (רַחֲמָא שְׂגִיָא), but he to whom little is forgiven will love little.
True rendering: Therefore I say to you, SHE WHOSE many sins are forgiven (same words) WILL LOVE MUCH (same words), but he to whom little is forgiven will love little.
- D. Lk. 10:4 ac. to Grk.: SALUTE (שְׁלָמוּ לִי) no man on the way.
True rendering: JOIN YOURSELVES TO (שְׁלָמוּ לִי) no man on the way.
- E. Lk. 11:41 ac. to Grk.: GIVE AS ALMS (עֲבַדוּ צִדְקָא) what is within, and you will have all clean.

True rendering: MAKE RIGHT (עֲבַדוּ צִדְקָא) what is within, and you will have all clean.

- F. Lk. 11:48 ac. to Grk.: Your fathers killed the prophets, and YOU BUILD THEM (the tombs) (אַנְתּוֹן בְּנִין לְהוֹן).
True rendering: Your fathers killed the prophets, and YOU ARE THEIR CHILDREN (אַנְתּוֹן בְּנִין לְהוֹן).

Exhibit XVII, A (Mk. 6:14; Mt. 14:2). *What* "powers" worked in the resurrected John? the powers (!) of God? If Herod and his companions believed that the Baptist had been raised from the dead, they of course believed that this had been done by the God of Israel; and "therefore," that *his* power was being manifested. The supposition of any other external agencies is absurd. Did the powers (!) of John himself "work in him"? This is equally absurd. The word rendered "powers" is the same which has just been used in this narrative (vss. 2, 5 in Mk.; 13:54, 58 in Mt.) to mean *miracles*, and the verb employed is one elsewhere used of "working" miracles, see Gal. 3:5.

There can be no doubt as to the equivalent Aram. words, and they solve the problem. We see again the familiar proceeding: translation according to the easiest reading, without study of alternatives. In Mt.'s Aram., the participle must have had the same form as in Mk.; and we may safely conclude that the ordinary way of writing such forms was with omission of the vowel-letter in the second syllable; as frequently in Heb. orthography (Gesenius, *Heb. Gramm.*, p. 42) and in old Syriac Mss.

Exhibit XVII, B (Lk. 7:45). An especially clear case of false rendering. The Grk. translator had just written "I came in," in the preceding verse; and now, seeing a return

of the same consonants, he rendered again as before; but this time he was wrong. The evangelist had said in vs. 37 (that which was a matter of course) that the woman came into the guest room *after* Jesus had taken his place there. Observe that in the immediate sequel (vs. 47) an equally certain example of mistranslation occurs; see below.

Exhibit XVII, C (Lk. 7:47). This passage is not merely "difficult," the trouble is incurable—in the Grk. Jesus indicates to Simon that he has a lesson for him, and the Pharisee listens politely, perhaps not eagerly. Jesus then shows, in a clear-cut little parable, what he wished to establish as his major premise: A debtor released from his debt is grateful in proportion to his feeling of relief from the burden. Simon assents, and waits for the application. When, however, Jesus proceeds to show how his parable applies to *the forgiveness of sins*, our Grk. version suddenly turns aside with an announcement (introduced by "therefore") out of keeping with what had preceded. The parable need not have been uttered. The argument is turned upside down, leaving Simon (and the rest of us) in bewilderment. The despair of interpreters, ancient and modern, is only too well known. Among recent commentators, Klostermann and Lagrange discuss the problem from all sides, but are obliged to leave it unsolved. Wellhausen tries to rewrite the Greek. Easton finds three distinct strata in the little section.

In the Aram., everything is clear; Jesus' lesson to Simon is really given, and the application of the parable is now perfect. As was remarked in *The Four Gospels*, the cause of the mistranslation was misunderstanding of the particle *dī*, which here was the relative pronoun, not the conjunction. Any student of Aram. who looks at the restored text

(above) will see at once how very natural Lk.'s mistake was, and how certainly the right interpretation of the ambiguous particle restores the original reading. Lk.'s manner of dealing with his circumstantial participle, which he properly renders "for she loved," hardly needs comment. The past tense of his translation was of course prescribed by the preceding Aram. participle.

This is not an instance of wrong vocalization, for no change of any sort is needed in the Aram. text. The passage is introduced here merely for the sake of juxtaposition with the preceding example.

Exhibit XVII, D (Lk. 10:4). The disciples are warned against that which might hinder them in their mission, or divert them from it. While traveling on foot, from city to city and from village to village, they inevitably would be tempted many times to join forces with other travelers; and it obviously was better, in view of the task before them, that they should not do this. *To return no salutation* would be merely uncivil. Littmann, *l.c.*, p. 26, thinks of wasting time in salutations long drawn out, such as may often be heard in the orient at the present day; but delay of this sort is not necessary, and our text could easily have specified long salutations, if this had been intended. The case of Elisha's servant (2 Ki. 4:29), sent at top speed on a life-or-death errand, is clearly not parallel.

Exhibit XVII, E (Lk. 11:41). Comparison of vss. 39-41 with Mt. 23:25 f. shows that Mt.'s version gives the original sense, including the indispensable metaphor (very neatly indicated) in the last clause of vs. 25. In Lk., the metaphor is made more prominent, with resulting awkwardness, and in vs. 41 there is a surprising change of meaning.

It has long been suspected that this text shows mistranslation from a Semitic original.

Lk.'s exhortation to these men who are "full of extortion and wickedness": *Give alms of what is within*, and all will be clean, compared with the corresponding phrase in Mt.: *Make clean the inside* of the cup, so that the outside also may become clean, certainly suggests an error of transmission. Almsgiving was an ever-present duty, and the customary phrase (rendered in Mt. 6:1) was in every one's mouth. The translator evidently saw it before him; but in fact it is quite disturbing in this place, neither well suited to the figure of speech nor yielding sound doctrine.

Wellhausen seems to have been the first to make a definite conjecture of mistranslation, and since his proposals have been given such a prominent place in all recent discussions of the passage, it is necessary to consider them here. In an article dealing with the Old Syriac Gospels, in the *Nachrichten der K. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, 1895, p. 12, he proposed to solve the problem by the Aram. word *zakḵū*, plur. imperative (really an Arabic form, not Aramaic), meaning either "make clean," as in Mt., or "give alms," as in Lk. This conjecture he repeated in the *Gött. gel. Anzeigen*, 1896, p. 265, and it was widely quoted. The objection was soon raised, by experts in Jewish Aramaic, that this verb could not mean "make clean" in the sense here required. Accordingly, in W.'s *Evang. Lucae* (1904) and in his *Einleitung* (1905) the conjecture was given this form: *daḵḵau*, plur. imperat., "make clean" (Mt. had the sing., *daḵḵī*), was read by Lk. as *zakḵau*, "give alms." (The correct forms are *daḵḵō* and *zakḵō*; those given by W. are Syriac, not Palest. Aram.) This new conjecture has

two serious defects: (1) The initial consonants are not easily confused; and after "cleansing" had already been mentioned, the copyist or translator could scarcely fail to see the same word here. (2) As Siegmund Fraenkel and others have remarked, there is neither evidence nor probability that the verb which W. renders "give alms" ever had this meaning in Palestine; it is an Arabian coinage. I may refer also to my *Jewish Foundation of Islam*, pp. 48 and 141. W.'s original conjecture would have "worked" perfectly in Arabic, but could not pass in Aramaic, and his later conjecture is by no means an improvement.

Concerning the reading "make *right*," suggested in the Exhibit, it is important to bear in mind that in the text translated by Lk. the first clause of vs. 41 referred to the last clause of vs. 39; it is the *men* who were intended, not the cups and platters. "That which is within" should have been rendered as in Mt. The word *saddiqā* (fem. for neuter, as usual) is exactly the word needed in the Lucan text. Unfortunately, its juxtaposition with the preceding verb seemed to present the familiar phrase, "give alms."

Exhibit XVII, F (Lk. 11:48). This example is like the preceding, in that a curious and disturbing mistranslation is explained by the parallel in Mt. The trouble is in a single word, written in Mt. precisely as in Lk., but wrongly interpreted by the latter. Mt. 23:29-31 is to be compared with Lk. 11:47 f. "You build the tombs of the prophets whom your fathers killed," Jesus says, and by this pious act you mean to declare [as Mt. expressly says in vs. 30] that you of the present day condemn the blind wickedness of your forefathers. Lk. then proceeds: "But by your own witness you do share in the deeds of your fathers, for they killed the

prophets and *you build their tombs.*" This is a ludicrous conclusion, proving the very opposite of what it is declared to prove! It adds nothing (except confusion) to what was said in vs. 47. In Mt. there is neither contradiction nor ambiguity: "So you bear witness against yourselves that *you are the sons* of those who slew the prophets."

The explanation of Lk.'s mistake is given immediately and certainly by the Aram., as any one can see who will look at the text printed above.²⁷ He had just translated the very same word, "build," in the preceding verse, and, as often elsewhere (see e.g. the note on 7:45, above), repeated his rendering without looking further. He could not render the pronoun ("build *them*") at the end of the clause, for it would refer either to "fathers" or to "prophets"! So he left the verb without an object.

According to Littmann, *l.c.*, p. 24, Professor Lietzmann does not believe that this is the true explanation of the difficulty. The author of the First Gospel, however, says in unequivocal terms that it *is* the "richtige Lösung," and Lk.'s own text requires it, if sense is to be made out of nonsense. Plain evidence cannot be so lightly ignored.

Exhibit XVIII. Wrong Vocalization of the Aramaic.

A. Lk. 13:32 ac. to Grk.: I shall cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and on the third day I shall be PERFECTED (ܡܫܠܡ).

True rendering: I shall cast out demons and perform

²⁷ The same mistake, precisely, was made in Is. 49:17. The Massoretic Hebrew reads "sons"; the Greek translator vocalized the word correctly, "builders."

cures today and tomorrow, and on the third day I shall be DELIVERED UP (ܡܫܠܡ).

B. Lk. 16:16 (Mt. 11:12 f.) ac. to Grk.: Until John, there were the law and the prophets; from that time onward the gospel of the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and every man IS BROUGHT INTO IT BY VIOLENCE (ܡܚܒܫ ܠܗ).

True rendering: Until John, there were the law and the prophets; from that time onward the gospel of the kingdom of God is proclaimed, but every man TREATS IT WITH VIOLENCE (ܡܚܒܫ ܠܗ).

C. Lk. 24:32 ac. to Grk.: And they said one to another, Was not our HEART BURNING (ܠܗ ܕܠܒܢܐ ܝܩܪ) within us, while he spoke to us in the way?

True rendering: And they said one to another, Was not our MIND OBTUSE (ܠܗ ܕܠܒܢܐ ܝܩܪ) within us, while he spoke to us in the way?

D. Jn. 6:21 ac. to Grk.: (He said to them, It is I; fear not!) Thereupon they WISHED (ܕܒܥܐ) to receive him into the boat.

True rendering: Thereupon they REJOICED GREATLY (ܕܒܥܐ) to receive him into the boat.

Exhibit XVIII, A (Lk. 13:32). It is not easy to think of Jesus as saying of himself at any time that he was about to be *perfected*, yet this is what the Grk. means, in spite of desperate attempts to make it mean something else. It would be a very strange thing for him to say to Herod, in the circumstances described. The message which he sends to "that fox" is simply this: I shall continue to do my work until the time appointed for me to lay it down. In the following verse he adds, in words addressed to his companions,

perhaps also to the Pharisees (cf. Mt. 23:37), that this indeed *must be*, in fulfilment of the divine plan; and that the betrayal is destined to be in Jerusalem, not in Herod's jurisdiction. (See the note on vs. 33, Exhibit XXI, C.) The passage is closely parallel to 18:31 f., where he says again that he is to be *delivered up* in Jerusalem, in fulfilment of scripture. So also 24:7; Mk. 9:31 and parallels. Jesus constantly uses this term (see the Aram., above) in speaking of the approaching end, and it gives the only reading which is suitable here. The familiar term "perfected" (by martyrdom) is written with the same consonants, but is manifestly out of place in the message to Herod.

Exhibit XVIII, B (Lk. 16:16; Mt. 11:12 f.). Until John the Baptist appeared, men had, for their guidance, only the law and the prophets. Now, something new has come into the world; how is "the kingdom of God" treated? Mt. 11:12 answers: It encounters hostile force. Those who have the power to do so "lay violent hands on" its representatives. John was seized, imprisoned, and beheaded; and Jesus is to have similar treatment (Mt. 17:12).

Lk. leaned on Grk. Mt., as usual, though the reading of his original was so widely different; and from Mt.'s version he took over a mistaken interpretation, and with it the Grk. verb, passive voice, which seemed to suit his own text. But men were *not* being driven in throngs into the kingdom of heaven; quite the contrary! Mt. goes on at once to say (vss. 16 f.), in the words of the children: "We have piped to you, and you have *not* danced."

Exhibit XVIII, C (Lk. 24:32). The two disciples reproached themselves for not having known who it was who had walked and talked with them. The interpretation of

the phrase used by them has been much discussed. If it is of Grk. origin, it means one thing; if Semitic, another thing. Did they mean to say that they *almost knew* who their companion was? or to tell *why* they did *not* know? It had been said at the beginning of the narrative (vs. 16) that their eyes were tight shut ("held fast," Aram. idiom), so that they could not recognize Jesus. The word "heart," in Heb. and Aram., most commonly means the *mind*, and the various mental activities. As for the participle, "burning," it is very significant that the three oldest Syr. versions, *with the Grk. before them*, refused to read in this way, but (using the same consonants) pointed according to the true Aram. idiom: "heavy, sluggish, obtuse."

It must not be overlooked that this same idiom had already been used in the preceding verses. In vs. 25, where Jesus wonders at their failure to comprehend what the Hebrew prophets had said, he calls them "*slow of understanding*"; precisely the phrase, the very words, which the Syr. translators recognized in vs. 32. Perhaps it was with this in mind that the two said, one to another: "Were we not, indeed, 'slow-witted,' while he was talking with us?" We might expect such a lively touch from this very skilful narrator.

Exhibit XVIII, D (Jn. 6:21). Why did not the disciples receive Jesus into the boat? The verb certainly implies that they did not. "They were willing, consented, to receive him" (see Zahn's parallels)—truly, a magnanimous concession on their part!—only makes a bad matter worse. It is evident that the verb is wrong; the evangelist could not possibly have written in this way.

As soon as the three consonants of the equivalent Aram.

verb are written out, the difficulty disappears. In nine cases out of ten they would represent the very familiar verb, "they wished"; in the tenth case, with quite different pronunciation, they would mean "they exulted, rejoiced greatly," and this is what the evangelist wrote. The construction is perfectly regular, a verb signifying to "be glad, rejoice, *exult*" followed by an infinitive; see Hab. 3:14; Prov. 2:14; Deut. 28:63; Jer. 32:41; Ps. 19:6. The verb here indicated would certainly not exaggerate the emotion of the disciples who were in the boat.

Exhibit XIX. Wrong Vocalization of the Aramaic.

- A. Jn. 7:37 f. ac. to Grk.: Whoever thirsts, let him come to me and drink. He who believes on me, as the scripture says, OUT OF HIS BELLY (מִן הַבֶּטֶן) shall flow rivers of living water.

True rendering: Whoever thirsts, let him come to me, and let him drink who believes on me. As the scripture says, OUT OF THE MIDST OF HER (מִן הַבֶּטֶן) shall flow rivers of living water.

- B. Jn. 10:7 f. ac. to Grk.: Verily, verily I say to you, I AM THE DOOR OF THE SHEEP (אֲנִי אֶתְּרֵהוֹן דִּי עֲנָא). All those who came before me are thieves and robbers.

True rendering: Verily, verily I say to you, I CAME AS THE SHEPHERD OF THE SHEEP (אֲנִי אֶתְּרֵהוֹן דִּי עֲנָא); all those who came before me are thieves and robbers.

- C. Jn. 14:2 ac. to Grk.: In my Father's house are many dwellings; IF NOT (אִלָּן), I would have told you that I go to prepare a place for you.

True rendering: In my Father's house are many dwellings; IT IS NECESSARY (אִלָּן), I tell you, that I go to prepare a place for you.

- D. Jn. 17:14 ac. to Grk.: I have given them thy word, and the world HAS HATED THEM (שֶׁנֶּא לְהוֹן).

True rendering: I have given them thy word, and the world WILL HATE THEM (שֶׁנֶּא לְהוֹן).

Exhibit XIX, A (Jn. 7:38). This is as convincing an example as can be found anywhere in the history of translation and mistranslation, and the demonstration of the original reading is remarkably interesting. The way in which a fine utterance is now substituted for miserable nonsense, and a plain allusion to Hebrew scripture replaces a blind reference, while every feature of the translator's error is explained, is recommended to the attention of students of the Gospels. Here is evidence which for many-sided cogency and consistency is not easily surpassed.

The beginning of the Grk. translator's trouble was his failure to recognize the characteristic parallelism (seen by many scholars):

Whoever thirsts, let him come to me,
And let him drink who believes on me!

By putting a full stop after "drink," the remainder of the passage was spoiled; not indeed for the translator, who could still "translate," but for every thoughtful hearer or reader. The supposed "scripture" is impossibly grotesque, and its connection with relief of thirst is not as direct as could be desired. The man of Jerusalem who heard such a description of the convert might well have been deterred from believing, and the mental picture of hundreds of believers in the condition described is not edifying.

Burney, *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 109 ff., not only recognized (with many other scholars) the allusion to familiar prophecies, but also insisted on preserving the parallelism above mentioned. He rightly saw that the absurd reading of our Grk. version must have resulted from some misunderstanding or corruption of the Aram. original, and offered a conjecture to explain the error. There is, however, no way in which the two Aram. words suggested by him could have been confused in the present passage; and the text which he reconstructed (p. 110) is neither good Aramaic nor comes anywhere near accounting for our Grk. The point which he makes (*ibid.*) in regard to the interpretation of Joel 4:18 (3:18) in the Midrash Rabba on Ecclesiastes is important and should not be overlooked.

The scripture to which Jesus refers is definitely Messianic, the depiction of a favorite detail in the prophecies dealing with the Coming Age. A great stream of living water, with its source at the temple, is to flow out from the holy city and bless the land. Joel (4:18), Zechariah (14:8), and Ezekiel (47:1 ff.) describe it in varied fashion; and it has mention also in one of the favorite Hebrew psalms, in the eloquent passage 46:5-8 (4-7 in the English version). It is to the last-named passage that Jesus refers, as is shown by two features of his free quotation: (1) this is the only case in which the stream is called a *river*; (2) the next-following verse of the psalm contains the phrase "*in the midst of her*" (Jerusalem), and these words would naturally be in the mind of one who referred to this picture of the holy city.

The citation is for substance only, as often elsewhere, and accordingly was in Aramaic, not in Hebrew. In the Aram. translation (Targum) of the psalm, "the midst of her" is

gawwah, the noun *gaw* with the suffixed feminine pronoun. This noun is regularly used for the "midst" of a city (as in Ezra 4:15); it is also employed in speaking of human beings and animals, and in this use would most naturally be rendered "belly." See e.g. Targ. Lev. 1:13; 3:3; Prov. 20:30; and (late Heb.) Sir. 10:9. The Grk. translator, having made his false beginning with "He who believes," had no choice but to read his Aram. text (the very same consonants) with the *masculine* suffix, *gawwēh*, and to write "out of his belly"! Every step in his unfortunate proceeding is plain, and so also is the true reading which he so completely missed.

Such evidence as that which is afforded by this passage, taken in connection with the multitude of plain indications of an Aramaic original, is perfectly conclusive; and there are in this Gospel, as has already appeared, numerous other examples of the same quality.

Exhibit XIX, B (Jn. 10:7 f.). The subject of this "chapter of the shepherd" is a familiar figure of speech, here admirably conceived, and in all its details consistently carried through—*except in vss. 7 and 9*. How did the shepherd come to the sheepfold? is the first question which is answered. He came *by the door*. Others, would-be shepherds, but really thieves, had climbed up some other way. The "good shepherd" was recognized and welcomed; the doorkeeper (John the Baptist) opened the door for him, in fulfilment of scripture, Mal. 3:23 (4:5). The thieves came to rob and kill; "I came to give life" (vs. 10).

Vs. 7 introduces trouble. Even its wording arouses suspicion, though this is relatively unimportant. The phrase, "door of the sheep" (instead of "door of the sheepfold," or

"door for the sheep"), is at least awkward, and the commentators pause to explain it. Truly serious is the sudden obscuring, or abandonment, of the simile begun in vss. 1-5; for the new picture is utterly incongruous with its predecessor. A writer or speaker may indeed finish using one figure of speech and jump to another; Jesus might with some reason have been represented, under other circumstances, as declaring himself the door, or the sheepfold, or the pasture; but in the present case there can be no such liberty, for the original figure has *not* been abandoned. The decisive evidence against the picture of the "door" is given by the subsequent context. Vss. 8 and 10 continue the figure of *the shepherd*; so do vss. 11-18, and 25 ff. The interruption made by vss. 7 and 9 is intolerable.

This has of course been felt and said by many commentators, though perhaps few aside from Wellhausen, Schwartz, and Heitmüller (cited in W. Bauer's *Johannes-evang.*, p. 102) have drawn the conclusion that these verses were not in the original text of the Gospel. Bauer himself remarks, that vs. 7 attaches itself to the relatively unimportant feature, *door*, whereas we should expect at this point to hear who the *shepherd* is. This, as shown above, is precisely what the original (Aram.) text of the Gospel did contain. Without the alteration of a single letter, the true sense is restored. Observe how "I came" is plainly contrasted with "all who came before me" (vs. 8), and "the thief comes" (vs. 10). Restoring the verb adds distinctly to the force of the passage: "I came *as the shepherd*"; the others, for their own unlawful profit. The wrong division of words made by the translator was an extremely easy and natural mistake. It may indeed have been made in the Aram. before

the time of the translator. As for vs. 9, it was inserted to give support to the otherwise completely isolated vs. 7; just as the equally lonesome verse, Mk. 9:49, was given a supplementary interpretation in many ancient Mss. and versions.

Exhibit XIX, C (Jn. 14:2). What the Grk. gives in the second half of the verse, whether the words are taken as a question or as a declaration, is mere nonsense. In this case also, corruption of the Grk. text and editorial alteration have been suspected; but here again, as in the preceding example and as usual, the reading of the original Aram. was faultless. It was the translator who made the trouble. The solution of the difficulty is ridiculously simple, and is certain. That which Jesus says here he repeats, in almost the same words, in 16:7: "*I tell you the truth, it is better for you that I go away.*" The verb here rendered "it is better" is presumably the same which was employed in the present passage, for it is regularly used in both meanings. The *necessity* is again emphasized at the end of the chapter, vs. 31; but the time when the eleven most needed to have this declared to them was at the beginning of this discourse, after Jesus had so disturbed them by announcing that he was soon to leave them.

The word *wālē*, "it is fitting, expedient, necessary," is very likely to be mistaken for the omnipresent *wēlā*, "and not." (I have seen this mistake made many times by students reading unpointed Syriac texts.) It was for this reason, evidently, that the word disappears from the beginning of the verse Targ. Prov. 24:26 in so many mss. and editions; see Levy's *Wörterbuch*. For the reading "if not, otherwise," the best examples are 2 Sam. 13:26 and 2 Ki. 5:17. Another

example, generally unrecognized, even by the learned Heb. tradition, is 1 Sam. 20:12.

Exhibit XIX, D (Jn. 17:14). "The world" neither knew nor cared anything about the obscure disciples of the Nazarene at the time when he addressed them; but the time was soon coming when they would stir up "hatred" on every side! The prediction is like that in Mk. 13:13 and parallels; cf. also Mt. 10:34 ff., Lk. 12:51 ff.

This is another of the numerous cases in which the Grk. translator interpreted the Aram. word before him as perfect tense, where the participle was intended; or rendered as present tense a participle which should have been rendered as future. See Exhibit X, A, B. A very striking example is in 10:18, where the Grk. reads: "No one *has taken* it (my life) from me, but I give it of myself," and the verb was very early and extensively emended to "takes," since the past tense is obviously wrong. The Aram. text had the participle (identical in form with the perfect tense), which might have been rendered either as present or as future.

Chapter VII

CONFUSION OF הוּא WITH הוּנָה

THE occasional interchange of these two graphically identical, but grammatically very different, little words is an amusing feature of the translation Grk. of the Gospels. As will appear, there are various ways in which the two may be confused, and when the several passages are brought together they form a very interesting group.

One result which the error may produce is a change of tense. The pronoun *hū(a)*, 3rd pers. masc. sing., much used as the copula in nominal clauses, denotes the *present* tense, unless the contrary is made evident by the context, while the verb *hwā* means "he *was*." The distinction between "he *is* living" and "he *was* living" may be important; and no one who is familiar with the LXX will be willing to pin his faith absolutely to the decision made by a translator. In the Gospels, it is in the (late?) translation of Jn.'s Aram. that nearly all of the mistakes of this nature occur. It is hardly necessary to remark upon the fact that they, wherever they are found, are the result of misreading a written text.

It is curious that an instance of this same confusion should be found in the textual tradition of the O.T. Heb., since here the corresponding form of the verb "to be" ends regularly in *hē*, not in *aleph*. However, in Bibl. Aram. and in Aram. inscriptions both endings are used, while on the other hand in Bibl. Heb. numerous forms properly ending in *hē* are found written with *aleph*; and therefore it is not diffi-

cult to believe that there was a time when a copyist of the Heb. text could easily make the orthographic error. The verse 2 Sam. 17:10 begins: "And he (*wě-hū*'), even the valiant man," etc., which in its connection is poor Hebrew. The context demands: "And it will come to pass (*wě-hāyā*) that even the valiant man," etc.; and this, precisely, was read by the Lagarde Grk.

Another variation of the error is shown in Mk. 5:21 f. and Jn. 18:25; where the pronoun, preceded by "and," beginning a circumstantial clause: "While he was," etc., is mistaken for a part of the main narrative: "And (he) was," etc.

To show how inevitably the two little words are confused: Even in the few Aram. chapters of Daniel there are several instances. In 6:11 the Massor. tradition varies, some Mss. reading the one word, some the other. In 5:19 Theodotion substitutes the pronoun for the verb in four cases. In 2:32 the LXX and Peshitta versions suggest that the pronoun now beginning the verse was originally the verb, ending vs. 31.

Exhibit XX. Confusion of ܐܗܘܐ and ܐܗܘܐ.

- A. Mk. 5:21 f. ac. to Grk.: When Jesus had crossed to the other side, a crowd gathered about him; AND HE WAS BY THE SEA (ܐܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܝܡܐ). And there came one of the rulers, etc.

True rendering: . . . a crowd gathered about him. AND WHILE HE WAS STILL AT THE LAKESIDE (ܐܗܘܐ ܥܠ ܝܡܐ), there came one of the rulers, etc.

- B. Jn. 1:15 ac. to Grk.: This WAS (ܐܗܘܐ) he of whom I said, etc.
True rendering: This IS (ܐܗܘܐ) he of whom I said, etc.
- C. Jn. 1:18 ac. to Grk.: The only begotten Son of God, who IS (ܐܗܘܐ) in the bosom of the Father, has declared him.
True rendering: The only begotten Son of God, who WAS (ܐܗܘܐ) in the bosom of the Father, has declared him.
- D. Jn. 3:13 ac. to Grk.: No one has ascended to heaven but he who came down from heaven, the Son of Man who IS (ܐܗܘܐ) in heaven.
True rendering: No one has ascended to heaven but he who came down from heaven, the Son of Man who WAS (ܐܗܘܐ) in heaven.
- E. Jn. 14:22 ac. to Grk.: Master, WHAT HAS HAPPENED (ܡܬܐ ܕܗܘܐ), that you will reveal yourself to us, and not to the world?
True rendering: Master, HOW IS IT (ܡܬܐ ܕܗܘܐ) that you will, etc.?
- F. Jn. 18:25 ac. to Grk.: Now Simon Peter WAS (ܐܗܘܐ) standing and warming himself. They therefore said to him, etc.
True rendering: While HE (ܐܗܘܐ), Simon Peter, was standing . . . they said, etc.

Exhibit XX, A (Mk. 5:21 f.). The ordinary reader would see in this passage nothing to object to. The last clause of vs. 21, however, is superfluous, for the first half of the verse had already told us that Jesus was on the shore of the lake. Accordingly, Codex D and its followers, and the Old Syriac version, omit the troublesome words, "*he was*," and Wellhausen, in his translation, follows these very un-

trustworthy guides. Klostermann (Comm.) sees that the clause must be connected with the following verse, but is prevented by the Grk. from making an acceptable rendering.

The moment the clause is turned into unpointed Aram., the explanation appears. We have here the ever-present "circumstantial" clause, in its classical form, introduced by the personal pronoun. It gives an added touch of life to the narrative. Before Jesus had left the landing place, and while the crowd was still gathering about him there, Jairus came, with his urgent request. The translator's choice of the wrong word, affecting only the literary form, was not a serious matter.

Exhibit XX, B (Jn. 1:15). As has already been said, the Grk. translator of the Fourth Gospel was especially careless in his interpretation of this Aram. word of three consonants. In this passage, the past tense ("was") disturbed the ancient interpreters, as is shown, for instance, by the variant reading in the Grk., and by the substitution of the present tense in the Syr. versions. The fact that the Grk. translator of the Gospel erred here is placed beyond doubt by the subsequent examples of the same mistake.

Exhibit XX, C (Jn. 1:18). Here, again, the Grk. has made serious trouble from the earliest times. Jesus was no longer "in the bosom of the Father," but on earth, and it was only in his human life that he could "declare" him. The Old Syr. (Curetonian) has: "who (came) *from* the bosom of the Father," but this is a purely arbitrary improvement. The Aram. verb, "was," instead of the personal pronoun, gives the original reading, beyond question.

Exhibit XX, D (Jn. 3:13). The last clause of this verse

(omitted in Westcott and Hort's Grk. text) is a capital example of the same error. Jesus says to Nicodemus that he can tell him of "heavenly things" (vs. 12). No other being on earth can do this; only he who came down from heaven for the purpose, namely "the Son of Man *who is in heaven.*" (!) This is such a glaring absurdity, that many texts and versions, ancient and modern, including a few of the oldest and best Mss., refuse to accept the clause, and simply expunge it. Jerome's Latin renders faithfully: *qui est in caelo*; and the English versions retain the difficult phrase. It is the original Grk. reading, as any critical examination shows; Zahn (Comm.) puts the case concisely. The texts and versions which (instead of omitting the offending clause) read "who *was* in heaven" represent the natural attempt to make sense. As for the Grk. translator of the Gospel, he simply rendered what he thought he saw before him, without raising any questions—just as the LXX translators did in thousands of similar cases.

Exhibit XX, E (Jn. 14:22). Jude's senseless question gives another very obvious illustration of confusion of the two little Aram. words. Of course nothing, hitherto unknown, had "happened" (!), to cause Jesus to reveal himself to his nearest disciples rather than to the world. The Aram. words of the question were precisely those which the translator renders correctly in 16:17: "What is this (that you say)?" What does it mean? There could be no clearer example of false rendering of a written Semitic text than this which the present passage affords.

Exhibit XX, F (Jn. 18:25). Here, the mistake made by the Grk. translator is the same which was made in Mk. 5:21; see, above, the note on this passage. By reading the

verb instead of the pronoun, at the beginning of the verse, the translator lost the important circumstantial clause, making of it a declarative sentence. As a result, the Grk. narrative implies an interval of time between vs. 18b and vs. 25, while in fact no interval was intended. The repetition in the Grk. has led to conjectures of conflicting accounts, misplaced sections of narrative, etc.; the impression of confusion naturally increased by the copyist's blunder which removed the verse which now is numbered 24 from its original position between vss. 13 and 14 (see the explanation of this transfer, in *The Four Gospels*, pp. 328 f.). When the two obvious mistakes have been corrected, the whole chapter is in its original form.

Chapter VIII

SLIGHT CORRUPTION OF THE ARAMAIC TEXT

THE evidence of actual corruption of the Semitic text underlying our Gospels is indeed very slight. It is clear that from the time when these first Christian writings were compiled and put forth, they were transmitted with much care. Mk. and Mt., to be sure, were translated into Grk. so promptly that their Semitic originals had had very little opportunity to receive verbal change. As for the Fourth Gospel: If, as there seems to be good reason to believe, it was not translated into Greek until nearly a generation after the time of its composition, the fact must be that the Aram. text which was rendered had in the meantime lain in concealment somewhere. There is every reason to believe that its text differed very slightly, if at all, from the original. The numerous mistakes which we can observe *may* all be due to the Grk. translator, rather than to any transcription of the Aramaic.

The Jews had learned, from long and unpleasant experience, the difficulty of preserving a sacred text. The Christians were able to derive some profit from the lesson. They found themselves in a position, well described in the first chapters of the Book of Acts, which made them wish to use to the full every advantage which they possessed, and to lose nothing which they had gained. Very much depended on the impression which their own scriptures could make, and they had every reason to do the little that was possible for the preservation of the original text.

The slight corruption shown in the following "exhibits" is a matter of single letters; errors—practically unavoidable—of a kind made familiar by the work of copyists in all ages and parts of the world. Where a consonant was repeated in the original text, one of the pair accidentally drops out. On the other hand, a scribe may be led by the context to write a consonant twice, connecting it in both directions. Certain letters are easily confused with one another, even when they are carefully written.

Accidental *omission* of words or passages from the text may of course have occurred where it is no longer possible to recognize the fact. With the aid of close parallels, or even without such help, from the context alone, it is possible in a very few instances to demonstrate the fact of a lacuna, or of a transposition, which must have taken place *in the Aramaic*. One word—a very important word—had disappeared from the text which is rendered in Lk. 13:33. In this instance, indeed, the omission was not accidental; the scribe who was copying the Aram. text believed himself to be correcting his predecessor's blunder. In the restored Aram. this is immediately obvious; see Exhibit XXI, C. In Mt. 5:32 two words, *wē-nāsēb 'uchrāntā*, "and marries another," quite indispensable to the sense, had been lost by accident before the Grk. translation was made; see the last paragraph of the note on Exhibit III, B. The true text will be shown in Chapter XI.

One of the most frequently occurring accidents of this nature, in the transmission of manuscripts, is caused by the oversight of a copyist whose eye strays from one group of letters to a similar group below. Having arrived at the

former, he goes on from the latter; and unless he happens to see his mistake at once, a portion of the text is omitted. In the Gospels there are three evident examples of such omission from the Aramaic text underlying the Greek. One of these, two words only, in Mt. 5:32, has just been mentioned. The others, more extensive losses, are in Mt. 14:12 f. and Mk. 9:13, and in each case the cause of the accident is plain to see. Fortunately, the portion of text missing in Mt. can be restored from Mk., and *vice versa*, since the parallels happen to be very close. The Aram. text thus restored by conjecture will be shown in Chapter XI; in the case of Mt. it was printed in the *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, vol. 54, p. 25, with brief explanation.

The copyist's error of the kind just described may bring about *transposition* of a portion of the text, rather than actual loss. In such cases the copyist sees his mistake almost as soon as it is made, and proceeds to rectify it (as well as he can!) in the usual way: by introducing, at the first practicable opportunity, the words, clauses, or sentences over which he had made his unfortunate leap. In our Biblical texts there are many examples of this very common proceeding. In the Gospels there are at least two transpositions which seem to have taken place in the original Aramaic; for they are perfectly accounted for on this supposition, and have no other natural explanation. The first of these is Mk. 4:31 f., a passage which in our Grk. is sadly confused; see for example the comment of Klost.-Gressm. In my *Four Gospels*, p. 299, I had not seen the explanation. The original reading was very simple and straightforward: (*It is*) *like a grain of mustard seed, which is less than all the seeds; but*

when it is sown upon the ground, it grows up and becomes greater than all the herbs. The Aramaic read:

כְּנֻגְרַחְדָּלָא דִּי זְעִיר מִן כָּל זְרַעִיא וְכִדִּי זְרִיעַ עַל אֶרְעָא סֻלֵּק
וְהוּא רַב מִן כָּל יִרְקִיא

The eye of the copyist caught the latter group of letters, where he should have written the former. He immediately saw his mistake, went back to the former group, and patched up his error in the way that seemed best to him. The sentence was irretrievably spoiled, but every word of the original was saved; indeed, "on the earth" was put in twice, for good measure.

An instance in the O.T., exactly like the preceding, is the passage Is. 63:19—64:2. The eye of the scribe leaped from *וירדה* in vs. 19 to *ירדה* in 64:2. After finishing the clause he went back to the former passage and filled the gap, incidentally repeating three words which he had written before. Another example from the O.T., illustrating a backward "jump," may be given for its interest. The scribe who produced the Massoretic text of 2 Sam. 6:3 f. copied correctly until he came to the word *העולה* at the end of vs. 3. Here his eye caught the word *עולה* two or three lines above, and he wrote it instead, proceeding then to write a second time six words which he had previously copied; the nature of his mistake shown not merely by the repetition, but also by a bit of impossible Hebrew—as in the Is. passage. Such slips occur in the copying of writings in any language, but they are especially easy in the unpunctuated consonant text of the Semitic.

The second example of accidental transposition in the Gospels is in Lk. 8:27-29. In the original text, vs. 29 b imme-

diately followed vs. 27, as in Mk. 5:3 f. The Aramaic ran as follows, beginning with the last clause of vs. 27:

וּבְכִיתָ לָא יְחֵב אֱלָא בְּקִבְרֵיא:
וְזִמְנִין סְנַאִין אֲחִיד בֵּה וְאַתְּאַסֵּר בְּשִׁלְשָׁלָן וּבְכַבְלָא נָטִיר וְתֵרַע
אַסְוִרֵיא וְאַשְׁמַלַח מִן שָׂדָא לְדִבְרֵיא: וְכִדִּי חָזָא לְיִשׁוּעַ קָרָא וַנְּפַל
וְגו'

It is evident that when the eye of the scribe who had just written *בריא* at the end of vs. 27 returned to the page, it fell upon the same group of consonants farther down, so that he went on with what is now vs. 28. Seeing his mistake, he introduced the omitted portion at the next possible opportunity. This explains perfectly an evident error which has had no other explanation.

It is of course ordinarily impossible to recognize *conflation* in the underlying Semitic, in distinction from the Greek. There are in the Synoptic Gospels numerous examples of secondary borrowing from one Gospel by another, and these, undoubtedly, all took place in the Grk. text. There are nevertheless a few passages in which it seems possible to recognize disturbing expansion which took place in the Aramaic before it was translated. As the first of these, I should name the curious phrase in Lk. 4:33, especially curious because of the adjective; were there clean demons? "Spirit" alone would be quite sufficient, as in 10:20 and 13:11. I am convinced that Wellhausen (Comm.) was right in pronouncing the phrase conflate; but, as was remarked in *The Four Gospels*, p. 307, the conflation must have taken place in the Aramaic. Between the words "spirit" and "unclean" the variant, "demon" (*shēdh*) was inserted. Lk. rendered in the only possible way.

Another passage is the last clause of Mk. 4:12, already mentioned, as a probable conflation of the original text, at the end of the comment on Exhibit I, D. The phrase "lest they should repent and be forgiven" is out of place in this context, and is significantly lacking in Mt. 13:13 and Lk. 8:10, which agree with Mk. up to this point. It is to be observed that the phrase is utterly unlike the LXX (Is. 6:10), while *it corresponds word for word with the Targum*. It is the sort of pendant that would easily be attached to a document in popular circulation, but would hardly have been included by the evangelist. There seems very good reason to believe that it found its way into the Aram. Mk. before the Grk. translation was made.

Much more important is the conflation in Lk. 22:17-20. The secondary element is vss. 17 and 18. No evangelist mentions any of the regular features of the paschal supper; there would be no sense in doing so (The hymn after its close is mentioned, very naturally, by Mk. and Mt.). The Synoptists tell merely of a little special ceremony introduced by Jesus while he and the twelve were at table, a ceremony in which was symbolized the partaking of his body and blood. First the bread: "This is my body." Then the cup: "This is the blood of the new covenant, my blood shed for men." Each of the three evangelists gives these essential features, in this order.

Lk.'s account, which is more concise than the others, is in our Gospel preceded by a passage, vss. 17 f., which supplies every portion of the text which is contained in Mk. and Mt. but is wanting in Lk.'s compact version; namely, in the ceremony of the cup. Not merely the very striking words relating to the fruit of the vine and the kingdom of

God, but also the exhortation, "drink of it, all of you," and the item "giving thanks" are included in it. It contains *only* what is in the two earlier Gospels; partly in different phraseology, but mainly with such verbal agreement as to ensure the identity. Though containing no allusion to the symbolism of body and blood, it is expressly made a part of the little ceremony, with very disturbing result.

The evident purpose of the passage is to gain completeness at this most important point. *Whose* purpose was this? Certainly not Luke's! He had before him the Grk. texts of Mk. and Mt., and could only have appended the important words (now vs. 18) to his vs. 20, where they obviously belong. It was another who undertook the rectification. Why did this author (or reporter) of vss. 17 f. omit, in his "authentic" text of the ceremony of the cup derived from Mk. and Mt., the sentence relating to "the blood of the covenant, shed for many"? *Because it already stood in the account which he wished to supplement.*

This is a clear case of interpolation, but it was not done in the Greek. The conflation had already taken place in Lk.'s source, as the evidence distinctly shows. As many commentators have observed, his hand is plainly to be seen in the Greek (rather awkward Greek) of vs. 18.²⁸ He is translating here, as everywhere else, and could only reproduce his original, though it spoiled the following account. The variation in wording, between vss. 17 f. and the corresponding sentences in Mk. and Mt., is just such as was usual in the multiform "gospel" material in Aram. which was carried in memory from town to town and repeatedly written

²⁸ The fact of Lk.'s own handiwork here, in the absence of any knowledge that he was simply rendering the Sem. text that lay before him, necessarily made impossible any recognition of the true character of these two verses.

out. Before Lk. found his Judean document, containing the story of Jesus' last days, it had received the troublesome insertion, the text of which was the following:

וְקַבֵּל בְּסֵא וְאִדִּי וְאִמֵּר סְבוּ דְנָה וּפְלִגּוּ לְכוֹן אֲרִי אֲמַר אֲנִי לְכוֹן
 דָּא אֲשִׁתָּא מְכַעֲנָן מִן פִּירָא דִּי גִפְנָא עַד דִּי יֵאָחַז מְלָכוּת אֱלֹהָא:

It is clear, from the wording of the original document, that the insertion could have been made only as and where it now stands.

It may be permissible in this connection to take account of a passage illustrating (if I am not mistaken) both conflation of the gospel text and a typical copyist's oversight, though the case has nothing to do with translation.

The conflation in the Grk. of Mt. 16:2-4, and the subsequent loss of a portion of the text, probably occurred as follows. Some time after vs. 4a had been interpolated from 12:39, a later copyist very naturally went on from "He answered and said to them" to the familiar conclusion—the severe rebuke of the Jews, never to be omitted!—"An evil and adulterous generation," etc., *which met his eye just below*, without noticing his omission of a portion of text. The accident must have taken place very early, and in an otherwise excellent copy; hence the absence of this interesting passage in many of the oldest and best Mss.

The supposed *insertion* of vss. 2b, 3 is commonly explained as "a freely composed gloss based on Lk. 12:54-56"; which, however, is utterly different in its material, similar only in the bare fact that it draws a lesson from the ability of men to predict some kinds of weather! This explanation supposes a proceeding which would be strange indeed, even if it were not a case of "freely composing" the words of

Jesus and inserting them, supported by no parallel, in a finished work. As against the supposition of a very ordinary scribal oversight, it can hardly stand.

Exhibit XXI. Slight Corruption of the Aramaic.

- A. Mk. 9:29 ac. to Grk.: Such (demons) as this cannot by any means be cast out, EXCEPT (אֲנִי אֵין) by prayer.
 True rendering: Such as this cannot by any means be cast out, NOT EVEN (אֲנִי אֵין) by prayer.
- B. Mk. 15:21 (Mt. 27:32, Lk. 23:26) ac. to Grk.: Simon of CYRENE (קִרְנִי), coming from the field.
 True rendering: Simon, A FARMER (קִרְנִי) coming from the field.
- C. Lk. 13:32 f. ac. to Grk.: I shall cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and on the third day I shall be perfected. Nevertheless it must be that today and tomorrow and on the day following I go my way, for it cannot be that a prophet should perish elsewhere than in Jerusalem.
 True rendering: I shall cast out demons . . . today and tomorrow, and on the third day I shall be delivered up. For indeed *it must be* that today and tomorrow I WORK (לְמַעַבֵּד), and on the day following GO MY WAY (לְמַעַבֵּר), for it cannot be that a prophet should perish elsewhere than in Jerusalem.
- D. Lk. 21:5 ac. to Grk.: As some were speaking of the temple, how it was adorned with beautiful stones AND VOTIVE OFFERINGS (וְקִרְבָּנִין), he said, etc.

True rendering: . . . adorned with beautiful AND GREAT (וְרֹךְ בְּנִין) stones, etc.

Exhibit XXI, A (Mk. 9:29). The reading of our Greek is impossible, as can easily be shown. Was the failure of the disciples the result of using false means? Recent commentators (Wellhausen, Klostermann-Gressmann, Swete, Lagrange, and others) have sought refuge in the supposition that they had failed because they neglected divine help, and attempted to exorcise this demon by the use of magic. This strange hypothesis will not bear examination. The twelve had been given power to cast out demons (3:15, 6:7). If on this occasion the nine, with one accord, had abused the great trust reposed in them, resorting to magic(!), Jesus could not have failed to set them right. Is he rebuking them for not having had recourse to prayer? If that had been the case, he certainly must have expressed himself in more definite words than these. He does not admonish them; what he says sounds as though he took it for granted that the use of prayer, as a means of gaining help, would not have occurred to any of them. The "fasting" which is dragged in by so many ancient witnesses does not help matters—even if it could be accepted as belonging to the original text.

The disciples were conscious of having used every means known to them; and they ask, in good faith, "*Why* could not *we* cast it out?" It must not be forgotten that they had not only been "given power" to perform this species of cure, but also had exercised it; 6:13 says that they had "cast out many demons." Had they all forgotten—within a very brief space of time—what they had learned? When their

efforts on this occasion were not successful, might it not have occurred to at least some one of the nine to try the means which had succeeded in so "many" cases?

Jesus, far from rebuking them, gives them some excuse by specifying "*this kind*" of evil spirit. This, along with the fact that he himself wrought the miracle without prayer, shows plainly enough that what he meant to declare was the unusual difficulty of this case, and the fact that the requirement for success was a full measure of *faith*; as had already been said to the boy's father in vs. 23, and is said emphatically to the disciples in the parallel account, Mt. 17:20. According to either evangelist, Jesus tells the twelve that this was too formidable a task for them, a case beyond the power of any prayer of theirs; for back of the prayer, in order to drive out a demon of this power, there must be such a degree of faith as mere human beings might indeed have (Mk. 11:23, Mt. 17:20, Lk. 17:6), but in fact at that time no human being did have.

This interpretation, so fully given by Mt., and plainly declared in Mk. (vs. 23), is nevertheless forbidden by the final words of vs. 29; words which, as shown above, have given much trouble. The source of the trouble was the misreading of a single Aramaic letter. *Nūn* and *pē* may be easily confused even in the "square characters" of this early time, and in the script of the Aramaic papyri there are cases of perfect graphic identity. It was natural for copyist or translator to read "except" in the immediate context, but "*not even* by prayer" is plainly (and exactly) the reading required.

Exhibit XXI, B (Mk. 15:21, and parallels). In both words, "Cyrenian" and "farmer," the first syllable of the

Aramaic word may be written in more than one way; but it is immaterial which way is conjectured, since in either case the graphic correspondence is perfect. As for the final syllable: *waw* and *nūn* are very frequently confused, both in inscriptions from various periods and also in the Heb. text of the O.T. There is no need to give examples, the fact is so well known.

Since this Simon is expressly identified in Mk., it was a matter of course that the Greek translators of Mt. and Lk. would follow their predecessor (for the reason already given) in rendering "Cyrenian." Moreover, the word *qirwāi*, "rustic," written with *waw*, is only Palestinian, and may not have been familiar to any one of the three translators. The only natural way of reading the adjective, for one who was not a born Palestinian, was with *nūn*. The statement that the man was *coming from the field* seems to decide in favor of "farmer, farm-laborer," as the original reading.

Exhibit XXI, C (Lk. 13:32 f.). The difficulty of vs. 33 is notorious. It makes no acceptable sense, besides contradicting vs. 32, and that very seriously. Did Jesus suddenly change his mind about continuing his work "today and tomorrow," as the Greek seems to say that he did? Moreover, the verb "go my way," however it may be understood, is ineffectual, and merely bewildering, in its present context. The Peshitta and Sahidic versions read: "It is necessary for me today and tomorrow *to work*"; an unwarranted doctoring of the text, for there could be no plausible way of accounting for the omission, *from the Greek*, of so important a verb. Wellhausen, seeing clearly the impossibility of the present text, devised an elaborate theory of interpola-

tion; and a few other commentators—in their despair—have tried to make his conjecture seem plausible.

Vs. 33 declares *as necessity* what vs. 32 had merely predicted: "Indeed it is necessary for me today and tomorrow [to work,] and on the third day to pass on, for" . . . etc. Certainly a verb has been accidentally omitted, and when the retroversion into Aramaic is made, the reason for the accident appears immediately. The two verbs, "work" and "pass on," are graphically identical. A copyist of the Aramaic corrected what he supposed to be a careless repetition.

"Going one's way" is a common Semitic euphemism in speaking of death. So this same verb is used in O.T. Hebrew (Job. 33:18, and elsewhere) as well as in Aramaic. Observe that Jesus is represented as employing it, in predicting his own death, in 22:22 (which, with its two verbs, "goes his way" and "is delivered up," sounds like a reminiscence of the present passage!), Jn. 8:21 f., and—the most striking instance—14:31, as the verse originally read. (Cf. also Mk. 14:21, Mt. 26:24.) The restoration of this passage in Lk. 13 is unusually interesting and important; vs. 33, with the contrast in its paronomasia, is a fine bit of Aramaic eloquence.

Exhibit XXI, D (Lk. 21:5). In the Aramaic document which Lk. had in his hands, the interest of the writer had been so completely taken up with the great discourse that he gave no attention to the setting, but merely wrote a brief introduction. The *scene*, however, was also of great interest, and must from the very first have been in imagination before the eyes of each reader or hearer of the discourse. Lk.'s source omitted it as familiar to everybody.

Jesus, with the disciples and others, had left the temple, and they were already away from the crowd and outside

the wall of the city (Mk. 13:1 f., Mt. 24:1 f.). As they looked back, they were thrilled (as beholders always have been, and are at the present day) by the sight of the enormous and beautifully fitted blocks at the southeast corner of the temple enclosure. The author of the Aramaic retroversion which lies back of the Bezae Greek (who knew the topography of Jerusalem, see Acts 12:10!) says in vs. 6, "stone upon stone *in this wall*"; and there is every reason to believe that this was intended in the Lucan account.

The "votive offerings" are utterly impossible. They could not have been seen, even if the discourse had been delivered in the temple enclosure (and any author or editor of that day would have realized that it could not have been delivered there; it was not at all fit for public hearing). Since the noun "votive offerings" and the adjective "great" (plural) look just alike in Aramaic script, and since the *size* of the stones is especially mentioned in Mk., the emendation seems certain. Commentators remark that "adorned with votive offerings" is a frequently occurring phrase, especially in descriptions of the temple at Jerusalem. Certainly; that is the reason, in all probability, why Luke saw the wrong Aramaic word, and made his mistranslation.

Exhibit XXII. Slight Corruption of the Aramaic.

- A. Lk. 19:20 ac. to Grk.: When THE OTHER(!) (אֲחֵרָא) came, he said, Master, here is your mina, which I have kept, etc.

True rendering: When THE LAST ONE (אֲחֵרָא) came, he said, Master, here is your mina, etc.

- B. Lk. 24:17 ac. to Grk.: What matters are these that you are discussing, as you walk? AND THEY STOOD STILL, LOOKING SAD (וְאֵפְכוּ נִסְסִין).

True rendering: What matters are these that you are discussing, as you walk WITH SAD FACES (וְאֵפְכוֹן נִסְסִין)?

- C. Jn. 5:34 ac. to Grk.: I myself do not receive (אֶחָד) witness from man, but I say these things THAT YOU MAY BE SAVED (דִּי אֶחָדוֹן פִּיחֹן).

True rendering: I myself do not receive witness from man, but I say that WHICH YOU WILL RECEIVE (דִּי אֶחָדוֹן פִּיחֹן).

- D. Jn. 7:8 ac. to Grk.: I will not go up TO THE FEAST, FOR (לְעִידָא דִּי) my time is not yet fulfilled.

True rendering: I will not go up YET, FOR (לִי עַד אֲרִי) my time is not yet fulfilled.

- E. Jn. 14:31 ac. to Grk.: But that the world may know . . . that as the Father has given me commandment THUS I DO,—ARISE, LET US GO HENCE(!) (בֵּן עֲבַד אֲנִי קִימוּ) (וְאִנְלִי מִכָּא).

True rendering: But that the world may know . . . that as the Father has given me commandment THUS I DO, I WILL ARISE AND GO HENCE (בֵּן עֲבַד אֲנִי אֶקִּים וְאִנְלִי מִכָּא).

Exhibit XXII, A (Lk. 19:20). In a series of ten, the enumeration, "the first, the second, and *the other*," with no previous identification of "the other," is impossible in any language. A few scholars have tried to smooth over the difficulty by altering the Greek, but with no sound basis for the proceeding. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc*, holds (as usual) to the textual evidence, but suggests that

between vs. 13 and vs. 20 the fact that there were *ten* servants had been forgotten. This is balm for the Greek, but a black eye for Luke. There is a blunder somewhere; this, at least, can be said with certainty.

As in the multitude of other cases, the explanation of the difficulty is found in the underlying Semitic. The ease with which the Aramaic adjectives meaning "other" and "last" might be confused can be seen by any one; they are actually confused in Dan. 4:5. That which is required here, in order to bring the parable to its right conclusion is, unquestionably, "*the last*."

Exhibit XXII, B (Lk. 24:17). In this case, the false reading was brought about by the accidental omission of a letter which was repeated—a common error. The blame is not to be put upon Luke, the text before him was defective at this point. The resulting reading, perfectly attested, is quite unacceptable, not to say absurd. "They stood still," instead of walking on, would have been an abrupt and impolite—as apparently resentful—way of receiving Jesus' question (why should he take the liberty of asking the subject of their conversation?). The Greek adjective means "angry, sullen," quite as often as "sad"; were they *vexed* at the meddling of the stranger? Hence the omission, or alteration, of the phrase, "and they stood still," in some of the best Greek texts and in the most important versions; this being the only way of giving Jesus a clear excuse for his question.

The Aramaic verb (a dialectal word), like its Hebrew equivalent, means normally "turn, turn about," but the Heb. is frequently used of altering a plan or habit, and may also mean "stop short" (in one's course), as is shown by the

LXX rendering in Judg. 20:39, *where the Greek has the same verb as in our passage*. There certainly is strong reason to believe that the Aram. text conjectured here is what the author of the narrative wrote, since the slip of the copyist was a very ordinary one, and the Greek translator could only render in the words which are before us.

Exhibit XXII, C (Jn. 5:34). The last clause of this verse seems incongruous with the tone of the discourse, see especially vss. 42-47. It is moreover not clear how these obdurate opponents of Jesus could be *saved* by being reminded of John's testimony; the expression is too strong to be plausible. And how account for the emphatic pronoun, "you," in the Greek, plainly contrasted with the emphatic "I" at the beginning of the verse?

In the original Aramaic, the mutual resemblance of the characters *waw* and *daleth*, coupled with the writing of the ending *-ūn* without the vowel-letter (as occasionally in O.T. Hebrew, see Ex. 21:18; 22:8; Deut. 8:13; Ps. 36:9, etc.), led to a misreading. It is obvious that the reading here restored is the original; nothing else can satisfy the context, or account for the Greek. The rendering given in my *Four Gospels* must be corrected accordingly.

Exhibit XXII, D (Jn. 7:8). Many since Porphyry (3rd century) have jeered at the spectacle of the fickleness, if not conscious deception, shown here by the "divine Logos"; for the "not *yet*," introduced into some Greek texts, is plainly secondary, inserted in order to get rid of the very unpleasant conclusion.

Retroversion into the original language seems to show that a slight error of transcription resulted in a false reading. For three reasons the scribe would be likely to see the

word "feast" in the second clause of the verse: the preposition after "go up" would naturally be taken to mean "to" (in fact, it signified the "ethical dative"); Jesus had just said in vs. 6, and now repeats, that his (supreme) "time" had not come; and especially, *the letters of the word "feast" are actually there, in the expected place*, with only the *yodh* transposed. In a text written (as all Semitic texts were) without any division of words the mistake was extremely easy.

Exhibit XXII, E (Jn. 14:31). This famous riddle of the Fourth Gospel is easily solved as a Semitic textual problem. Retroversion into Aram. (the precise words, and their order, all certain) shows the cause of the trouble. The very common omission of one of two consecutive *alephs* resulted, necessarily, in the reading shown in our Grk., as any one familiar with either Aram. or Heb. can see. The case might therefore have been included in the following Exhibit (XXIII), see below.

It is obvious that our Grk. does not say what the evangelist himself must have said. What was it that Jesus declared must be done "in order that the world may know," etc.? A sentence is begun, but (in our Grk. text) *is not finished*. We will "arise and go away" could not possibly serve as the conclusion! Moreover, Jesus and the disciples do not arise and go out; and (an equally significant fact) the discourse in chap. 15 is the immediate and necessary continuation of chap. 14. Up to this point, the disciples have heard the distressing announcement of a coming separation from their master; now comes the all-important injunction: *Nevertheless, abide in me*. Unless the last three words of vs. 31 contain the announcement for which impressive

preparation has been made, we are left not only with a final clause hanging in the air, but also with an absurd interruption of a great discourse.

The progress of thought in the concluding verses, 25-31, of chap. 14 is not in the least obscure. Here is declared again that which has been the burden of the whole chapter, introduced clearly in its opening verses: I must go from you, but I will return. The comforting spirit will be sent to you. The devil is now to have his seeming triumph, but the triumph will be brief. (These things are repeated in the passage 16:6-11, a close parallel which must not be overlooked.) With vss. 30 f. comes the conclusion: The time is now very short; the "prince of this world" is already at the door; but neither the plan nor the power are his; of my own will, in order that the world may know the truth, I GO MY WAY. This very common euphemism, often used by Jesus in speaking of his approaching death, has already been discussed, in the treatment of Lk. 13:32 f.; see Exhibit XXI, C.

The restored reading gives the chapter its natural ending, and *the unfinished sentence its conclusion*; while the supposed corruption of the original Aram. text is very slight indeed and readily explained. The portion involved in the error read: *אנאקומואול*. One of the two consecutive *alephs* was omitted (see the following Chapter, with its examples), as happened also in 4:25 ("the Messiah"), 5:27, and 8:56. This produced the reading *qūmū*, "arise!" (plural), and the mischief was done, for what followed could only be read as cohortative plur., "let us go."

This is so typical an error, of either scribe or translator, and so perfect a restoration of the lost connection of the two chapters, that even if it stood quite alone in the Gospel,

it might well be accepted as the solution of a grave difficulty which has no other plausible explanation. When it is put side by side with such passages—clear examples of mis-translation—as 1:13; 3:13; 5:44; 7:3; 7:38; 12:34(!); 14:2; 19:35 (to mention no others), the conclusion is as certain as any result of literary criticism can be. The original language of this whole Palestinian²⁹ Gospel was Aramaic, and our Grk. is a translation.

²⁹ For evidence of the Palestinian background and quality of this Gospel, see Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, pp. 385 ff.; Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 126 f.; Lagrange, *Évangile selon St. Jean*, pp. cxxi ff.; Montgomery, *Origin of the Gospel according to St. John*, pp. 5-11; Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, Lecture IV; Schlatter, *Sprache u. Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*; Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 418 f.; Zahn, *Evangel. des Johannes*, pp. 27 ff. The curious suggestion, that the great array of evidence of this sort could be explained by supposing a mere pilgrim to the holy land, is well answered by Lagrange; see also Zahn, p. 29.

Chapter IX

ALEPH INSERTED OR OMITTED

CERTAIN "formative letters," in Hebrew or Aramaic, will appear with especial frequency in any considerable list of false readings. Constantly employed with various signification at the beginning or end, or at both ends, of Semitic words, they are easily misinterpreted in any reading but the most careful. Where such a consonant occurs *once*, as either final or initial letter, it may by mistake be made both the ending of one word and the first letter of the next following; either thus read by a translator, or actually written twice by the scribe who copies the text. On the other hand, where the letter was *repeated* in the original text, it is obvious that the accidental omission of one of the pair would be even easier than in the case of ordinary consonants.

In Heb., the character *hē* is one of the chief sufferers. Serving as definite article, fem. ending, verbal performative, ending of many verb forms, etc., it is sometimes wrongly doubled and very often accidentally omitted, in the O.T. text. In Aram., the character *aleph* serves in these various capacities, and accordingly is one of the principal victims of inaccurate reading. The frequency of the omission of this letter, as a weak consonant, in the Massoretic text of the Heb. O.T. is noticeable. To the partial list given in *The Four Gospels*, p. 320, add Deut. 31:29; Jer. 44:23; Ezek. 28:16; Lam. 1:21b (as in the Peshitta); and doubtless there are still other examples.

True rendering: Because HE IS THE SON OF MAN (reading the *aleph*).

- E. Jn. 8:56 ac. to Grk.: ABRAHAM REJOICED (אֲבְרָהָם רִצָּח) to see my day, and he saw it and rejoiced.

True rendering: ABRAHAM PRAYED (same, with the *aleph*) to see my day, and he saw it and rejoiced.

- F. Jn. 11:2 ac. to Grk.: . . . and her brother Lazarus WAS SICK (וְרֵעִיהָ לָזָרֵס הָיָה חָלוּל, omitting the *aleph*).

True rendering (with *aleph*): and Lazarus, THE SICK MAN, WAS her brother.

Exhibit XXIII, A (Mk. 6:8 f.; Mt. 10:10, Lk. 9:3). Jesus' prescription as to the equipment (or lack of equipment) of the twelve, as they go forth on their first mission, is given somewhat differently by the three evangelists, though their agreement is more striking than their disagreement. Mk.'s account orders sandals, and permits a staff; Mt. and Lk. (22:35) deny both, though our text of Lk. 9:3 omits mention of the sandals. Various attempts at harmonization have been made, but none has found general acceptance. Some (e.g. Swete, *Comm.*) have thought that the later evangelists may have increased the rigor of the command. Others (e.g. Plummer, Lagrange) suppose the original injunction to have been indefinite: "Make no special preparation, go as you are." Our three sources, however, agree that the commandment was not indefinite, but specific; and the wisdom of such instruction is evident.

Moreover, quite aside from the fact that the initial words in both Mk. and Lk. are "Take *nothing* for the way," the prescription in Mt. and Lk. seems more likely to be the

original than that in Mk. The "staff" was quite unnecessary. Unpretentious travelers have always been more likely to dispense with it than to use it. As for the "sandals," the seventy, at least, went forth without them (Lk. 10:4) and felt no lack (cf. 22:35). It is not easy to see why Jesus should have *ordered* this footgear for men who might well have preferred to go barefoot.

The suggestion of possible help from Aram. has been made more than once, and in more than one way. Wellhausen, *Evang. Marci*, thought that the resemblance of *lā*, "not," to *illā* (or *ellā*), "except," might explain the deviation of Mt. and Lk. from Mk. (the original) in the case of the *staff*. In my *Four Gospels* I adopted this conjecture for the Lucan verse, but I am now convinced that another application of it is much better, indeed the perfect solution. Professor C. H. Dodd, quoted in Streeter's *The Four Gospels*, p. 191, note, proposed to turn the evidence in the other direction, charging the error to the Marcan tradition. Dodd's conjecture would apply equally to both of the items in which there is disagreement. If the initial *aleph* which makes *lā* into *illā* came from the ending of the preceding word, as in so many other cases, the agreement of the three evangelists is complete. Additional support for this conclusion, from general probability, has just been given; and the frequently occurring evidence of haste on the part of the Grk. translator of Mk. (*Four Gospels*, p. 274) may also be taken into account.

Exhibit XXIII, B (Jn. 3:33). This verse, as it stands in our present text, is not merely weak, it is worse than superfluous. It neither brings a conclusion derived from the preceding verses, as its opening words lead us to expect,

nor does it give the ground for the following doctrine, which professes to rest on it. Yet the truth which it declares is introduced in impressive words: the lone believer (John the Baptist) who accepts the witness of him who came down from heaven *has set his seal to it*—that God is true. As though any man who believed in God at all could need to have this solemn assurance.

The Baptist's testimony to Jesus culminated at this point, and it is perfectly evident, both from the preceding verses and even more from the following, what he must have said at the end of vs. 33. He declares again, as in 1:34 (cf. also 1:1), that he who came from above, who is to take away the sin of the world, "is truly a divine being"; God gave³⁰ him *in full measure* (vs. 34) the divine spirit. This, and this only, satisfies the whole context.

Littmann, *l.c.*, p. 33, would prefer *bēqushṭā*, instead of the simple *qushṭā*. The former is indeed usual, but the latter is unimpeachable Aramaic; and this very word, used thus as adv. accus., is to be seen in the J. Targ. of Gen. 3:1. The use of Heb. *ēmeth* in Jer. 10:10 and Ps. 132:11 is exactly similar.

Exhibit XXIII, C (Jn. 5:44). This passage was discussed in Exhibit VIII, B, and little need be added here. "The only God" is a phrase ill-suited to this context (Zahn, p. 310, note), and the early textual tradition had trouble with it. Vss. 43 f. draw the contrast between the true Messiah, with credentials from heaven, and the merely human pretender, coming in his own name. The people are ready to receive the latter, while they reject the former; they will

³⁰ It may be conjectured that the Grk. present tense furnishes yet another instance of wrong vocalization of the Aram. word: *yēhab*, "gave," not *yāhēb*, "gives," being the form intended.

welcome the glory of a human king, but have no desire for the glory offered them by *the only Son of God*. This reading is plainly necessary; that given in our Grk. makes no sense. Observe, moreover, the relation of this verse to 1:14, which deals with this same "glory," the glory of *the only-begotten son*!

Exhibit XXIII, D (Jn. 5:27). According to our Grk., Jesus bases his appointment as judge of all the world at the final assize on the fact that he is a human being. As Zahn, p. 299, note 62, remarks, the reason given "would equally well, and equally ill, justify the appointment of any man to this office." There is no reasonable interpretation of the saying; as Zahn rightly insists, the ordinary explanation is ruled out by the undeniably close connection with vs. 26, which is a part of the same sentence. But the connection of vs. 26 with the preceding verses is equally evident, and it is only by ignoring this that Zahn arrives at his own interpretation, p. 300 mid., which is essentially the same as that which he denies to his fellow exegetes.

The claim made here by Jesus is the same which is made throughout these discourses, and is perfectly understood by his hearers (5:17 f., 10:30, 33), namely, that his authority is that of a *divine* being. As vss. 22 and 25 say in so many words, he received the appointment to judge as *the Son of God*; and vs. 27 adds the other title, *the Messiah*. Cf. Enoch 69:27, "And all judgment was committed unto him, the Son of Man." The reason why the latter title is added is plain to see. The evangelist represents Jesus as appealing here, as so often elsewhere, to Hebrew prophecy; in this case, prophecy of the final judgment. The allusion in vss. 25 and (especially) 28 f. to Dan. 12:2 is obvious, all his hearers

would recognize it. Equally obvious is the reference of the Messianic title, *Bar-ēnāshā*, "the Man," to its origin in the same prophecy, 7:13 f., where he who came in the clouds of heaven sat on a throne (vs. 9) beside the Ancient of Days, in the judgment scene, and was appointed to reign forever.³¹ Cf. Acts 7:56; 10:42 f.

Exhibit XXIII, E (Jn. 8:56). The two verbs which are confused in this passage (whether by a copyist of the Aram. text or by the translator) are the same which caused similar trouble in 6:21; see Exhibit XVIII, D. Burney, *Aram. Origin*, p. 111, saw that the tautology in the sentence could not be original, and suspected mistranslation, but made no plausible suggestion as to the text which was rendered. The verb which he conjectured is not known in Western Aramaic, and (if used as in Syriac) would *not* have been misunderstood, since its regular meaning, "desire," is the one which the passage plainly requires. The true explanation is to be found in the habitual carelessness with *aleph*.

Exhibit XXIII, F (Jn. 11:1 f.). The intolerable awkwardness of this passage is well known. "A certain" sick man, Lazarus, is introduced, who lived in the same town with Martha and Mary; the reader would gladly know whether he was acquainted with the two sisters. The narrator, however, at once loses interest in the man, and hastens to tell us about Mary. Her story is already familiar in Chris-

³¹ The prediction in Dan. 7:13 f. of the long-expected one, *a divine being in human form*, destined for an eternal reign in Jerusalem, is certainly definite enough (the passage Enoch 69:26-29, cited above, shows that it was perfectly understood); and this, exactly, with the added specification of Davidic lineage, had been the substance of the Jewish Messianic hope for centuries past. When the detailed *historical interpretation* of Daniel's vision reached this point, in vs. 26 f., the author of the apocalypse had no need to repeat himself, and showed his wisdom, and his artistic sense, by using only vague terms. This was *not* the place to be definite.

tian circles: "It was that Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick." It is needless to say that the evangelist did not write thus. Walter Bauer, *Komm.*, gives a partial list of those scholars who have pronounced the text corrupt.

The corruption is extremely slight, however, merely the familiar result of the careless writing of a single *aleph* instead of two. Otherwise, the passage is in perfect shape, the desired information standing where it should stand, at the end, and the important word, "her brother," occupying the emphatic position at the beginning of the last clause, in the Aramaic. The order of words here may have helped to mislead the translator—or the scribe who copied the original text.

Chapter X

WAW OR YODH INSERTED OR OMITTED

MUCH of what was said in the preceding chapter in regard to *aleph* applies equally to the two "formative letters" which are now under consideration. The consonant *waw*, indeed, is more likely than any other letter to be given a false repetition; this chiefly because of the extravagant use of the conjunction, which in its various meanings may begin almost any sentence or clause. This particular form of textual corruption, now the work of the copyist, now of the translator, is very familiar in the O.T. There are in Biblical Hebrew many instances like those shown below in Mk. 10:32 and Jn. 1:12 f., where a verb originally sing. number is made into a false plural by duplicating the *waw* of the following sentence or clause. Excellent examples of just this nature are Ezek. 46:9 and 10(!); Ezra 2:62 (cf. Neh. 7:64); Ps. 22:32.

See also such outstanding examples of the falsely doubled letter as 2 Kings 9:33; 11:1; and Jer. 4:5. In Gen. 34:29 we read: . . . "and their children and their wives they took captive and plundered, *and* all that was in the house." Here the Grk. has preserved the true reading: "and their children and their wives they took captive, and they plundered all that was in the city," etc. In the same way, perhaps, was introduced the unnecessary "and" ("also") in Acts 3:24: "And all the prophets, from Samuel and his successors onward, as many as spoke, (*and*) told of those days." The

verb "spoke" ended with *waw*, and the conjunction meaning "also" has a strange sound in this Semitizing Greek.

As for the letter *yodh*, the cases of false doubling are of course less numerous, in the transmission of any Heb. or Aram. text. The only example which has been found in the Gospels is Mt. 2:23 (see below), a passage in which the antecedent probability of this misreading is very strong. Even if a scribe should copy the words correctly, the translator would be almost certain to "see double." In the Massor. Heb. the same mistake, in exactly this form, may be seen in Is. 26:19 and Hos. 9:16. Other examples of the doubling are 2 Chr. 24:25; Is. 12:1; 41:14 (read *rimmath*); 62:5; Zech. 12:5.

Exhibit XXIV. Slight Corruption (repeated *waw* or *yodh*).

- A. Mk. 10:32 ac. to Grk.: They were on the way, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them, AND THEY WERE AMAZED, AND THEY WHO FOLLOWED WERE AFRAID (וְהָיוּ וְדִי אֵלֶיךָ הָיוּ בְּתֵרָה דְּחִלּוֹ).

True rendering: They were on the way, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them, AND HE WAS IN DEEP DISTRESS (וְתֵרָה), and they who followed were afraid.

- B. Jn. 1:12 f. ac. to Grk.: To those who received him he gave power to become children of God, to those believing ON HIS NAME, WHO WERE BORN (בְּשֵׁמָה דִּי אֱתִי לֵדוֹ) not of blood, nor of carnal desire, nor of the will of man, but of God.

True rendering: To those who received him he gave power to become children of God, to those believing

ON THE NAME OF HIM WHO WAS BORN (בְּשֵׁמָהּ דִּי אֱתִילָד) not of blood, nor of carnal desire, nor of the will of man, but of God.

- c. Mt. 2:23 ac. to Grk.: He came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; in fulfilment of that which was said by the prophets, that HE SHOULD BE CALLED A NAZARENE (נָצָרִי יְהוֹקָנָא).

True rendering: (The prophecy was fulfilled) that HE SHOULD BE CALLED 'BRANCH' (נִצְרָא יְהוֹקָנָא).

Exhibit XXIV, A (Mk. 10:32). Since in the Semitic script there was no division of words, not even a space at the end of sentences, a mistake of the nature illustrated in the first two examples given here was very easy indeed. In the Hebrew text of the O.T. there are many cases of exactly this error, yielding occasionally readings which are absurd, as in Josh. 2:4 and Ezek. 46:9 f. (our translations of course rejecting the extra *waw* and rendering according to the necessary meaning). Similar repetitions of *yodh* are also common in O.T. Hebrew, and we shall see how in Mt. 2:23 the little mistake has wrought great mischief.

In the Marcan passage now before us, we see chaos produced by this familiar slip of the copyist, the repetition of the little perpendicular mark which indicates both the plural verb and the conjunction. Our Greek text leaves us to guess why the Master's followers were "amazed," and why the members of the other(!) company were "afraid." Misunderstanding of the former Greek verb is partly responsible for this. In the less-common use illustrated here, it is not the idea of *surprise* that is expressed, but rather that of *distress*, or *painful agitation*. See especially Mk. 14:33 (a most important parallel!), also 1 Macc. 6:8, Wis-

dom 17:3, 1 Sam. 16:14 (Aquila!), etc. Jesus' distress, the cause of which is told in the verses which follow, was of course seen and felt by those who accompanied him as he set out on this last journey.

Exhibit XXIV, B (Jn. 1:12 f.). Our Greek contains a very serious blunder, of which the cause is obvious and the result an impossible saying. The verb ("was born," "were born") is in the *past tense*, not the future; this is not a promise of being "born again" (3:3). Only one being could be described in the phrases used here. There was an *only begotten* Son, born not of the flesh nor of human will, but of God (1:18, 34; 3:16, etc.). The present passage has its perfect parallel in 3:18, which declares the necessity of *believing on the name of the only begotten Son of God*—showing plainly enough that 1:13 is corrupt.

The Greek translator's mistake was an easy one, an error of which, as we have seen, there are very many examples. Burney, *Aram. Origin*, pp. 34 f., explains the present case fully. The verb "born" stood at the end of the sentence (as it does in the Syriac version), and the next verse began with the conjunction *waw*, "and." This *waw* was read as the last letter of the preceding verse, thus making the verb *plural*. It is precisely the same mistake which was made in Mk. 10:32, resulting in the false plural; see above. It was a transfer of Aramaic *waw* in the other direction, making a final verb singular which should have been plural, that caused the absurd Greek reading at the end of the verse 1 Esdras 3:3. It was the three young guardsmen who "watched," not the king who "awoke."

Exhibit XXIV, C (Mt. 2:23). This passage, also, fur-

nishes a very obvious specimen of mistranslation, or erroneous transcription, of a written Aramaic original.

The alleged citation of "the prophets" has been the subject of endless discussion from the first Christian centuries onward, but the riddle has remained unsolved. And indeed, it is perfectly insoluble on the supposition of a gospel composed in Greek. There is no such prediction in the O.T., nor anything that could justify the evangelist's (apparent) assertion. Interpreters in a long succession, beginning with St. Jerome, have wished to find here some legitimate connection with the *Neser*, "Branch," of Is. 11:1, but without success. This is, nevertheless, the scripture to which Mt. refers; and inasmuch as the Messiah is also styled "Branch" in Jer. 23:5 and 33:15 (though another Hebrew word is employed), the evangelist's plural, "prophets," has a fair excuse.

Just as soon as the phrase, "he shall be called *Neser*," is written *in Aramaic letters*, the long-existing puzzle is explained. Because of the statement immediately preceding, that Jesus dwelt in Nazareth *in fulfilment of scripture*, the copyist or translator would be certain to regard the *yodh* following the name as the ending of the gentilic adjective, forming the word "Nazarene." The scribe would write the letter twice, the reader would see it double, and certainly neither could be supposed to "look up" the reference in whatever scrolls of the Hebrew prophets it might be possible to acquire! "*Neser*" and "Nazareth" belong to the same Semitic root, and I plan to show in another place, on the basis of well-known usage, why the Greek transcription of the gentilic adjective contains *zeta omega*.

Exhibit XXV. Slight Corruption (*waw* inserted or omitted).

- A. Mk. 6:20 ac. to Grk.: Herod feared John, whom he knew to be a just and holy man; and he kept HIM, AND many things which he had heard from him HE DID, and he heard him gladly³² (וְנָטַר הָיָא לֵהּ וְנִשְׁמַע מִנֵּה וְעָבַדוּ וְשָׁמַע הָיָא לֵהּ בְּנִיעִמָּא).
True rendering: Herod feared John, . . . and he kept (in memory) many things which he had heard from him, for he heard him gladly (same Aramaic text, with the bracketed portions omitted).
- B. Mt. 24:51, Lk. 12:46 ac. to Grk.: (The master of that servant) will divide him, AND his portion with the false ones WILL APPOINT (יְפַלְגֵּהּ וְנָחַלְקָהּ עִם שְׂקָרִיָּא וְנִשְׁמַע מִנֵּה).
True rendering: (The master of that servant) will DIVIDE HIM HIS PORTION with the false ones (same Aramaic text, with the bracketed portions omitted).
- C. Jn. 7:3 ac. to Grk.: His brethren said to him, Go forth, get away to Judea, so that YOUR DISCIPLES ALSO MAY SEE YOUR "WORKS" WHICH YOU PERFORM (יְהוֹנָן מִלְּמִידֵיךָ עָבַדְתָּ יְהוָה).
True rendering: . . . Go forth . . . to Judea, so that THEY MAY SEE your "disciples" AND the "works" (lit., *your*³³ works) which you perform (same Aramaic text, except for the conjunction in וְעָבַדְתָּ).

Exhibit XXV, A (Mk. 6:20). In the three examples which here follow, the trouble begins in a phrase which

³² Aramaic slightly improved over that conjectured in *The Four Gospels*, p. 299.

³³ The suffixed pronoun would be used here in the Aramaic, but its rendering in the Greek translation is decidedly displeasing.

might be understood in either of two ways; and the context eventually shows that it was misunderstood, the result being a false division of clauses. In such cases, it is usually impossible to decide whether the mistake was made by the copyist of the Aramaic, or by the Greek translator; either one might easily have misread. The resulting text may differ from the original only in the presence or absence of the conjunction "and"; but it frequently happens, when the mistake of this sort is made, that a word must be supplied to finish out the newly created clause.

In Mk. 6:20 the Aram. verb "he kept" was followed by a pronoun which might be either the direct object, or the "ethical dative" so characteristic of Aramaic and so constantly employed. Since Herod's imprisonment of John had just been narrated, the interpretation "he kept him (*in prison*)" was decidedly the more natural (though the wrong one); and the clause which then followed required an inserted word, supplied by the sense, to complete it. But the Aram. verb (also Hebrew) is regularly used for "keeping *in memory*"; cf. Dan. 7:28, Lk. 2:19, etc., and here the exact rendering would be "he kept for himself." As to the inserted word, the Greek testimony varies. I believe that "*he did many things*"—a very difficult reading, when once it is reflected upon—was the original, and that it was improved to "he was greatly perplexed," perhaps with the help of a suggestion from Lk. 9:7.

The insertion of a word to complete a clause created by a wrongly inserted "and" is a thing very familiar to those who have worked long with Semitic Mss. and their renderings. It would be easy to illustrate extensively, if space permitted. A typical instance from O.T. Hebrew is to be seen

in Is. 41:29 (my *Second Isaiah*, p. 321). A capital example in a Greek translation from Aramaic is afforded by the Lagarde Greek of 1 Esdras 4:39 (*Ezra Studies*, p. 25), where the copyist shied at the strange Aramaic idiom, faithfully rendered in the standard text.

Exhibit XXV, B (Mt. 24:51, Lk. 12:46). Another case of the same nature; highly interesting in itself, and of added importance as one of the examples of the appearance of the same corrupt reading in more than one Aramaic document—as might have been expected.

The part of the verse which describes the fate of the unfaithful steward does not sound quite plausible. Is this an instance of ungovernable temper on the part of a householder? The steward's outrageous conduct was of a sort to which servants given free hand, in the absence of the master, have always and everywhere been especially prone. It does not appear that in this case the householder's property had suffered any considerable loss, or that anything had been done which could require the police to step in. The usual punishment of such mismanagement has been to dismiss the culprit in disgrace, branded as faithless and likely to have difficulty in finding another place. Moreover, it is quite evident that after this particular sinner had been "cut in two" it could make no difference to him, or to any one else, where they should "appoint his portion."

The false reading came into being very naturally, and its occasion is very obvious. The idiom, "divide him his portion," is good Semitic; we see it used, with the same Aramaic verb conjectured here, in the Peshitta version of Is. 53:12 and Jer. 37:12. The pronom. suffix attached to the verb (as in the passage in Is., just mentioned) was taken

by the scribe to be *direct* object (as ordinarily it would be), and the rest followed as a matter of course. The mistake was made as soon as the document began to be circulated, and we have evidence that at least *two* of the copies current in Palestine contained the error. The several variations between Lk.'s Grk. and that of Mt., in this paragraph of a half-dozen verses, are such as to indicate two Aram. texts nearly identical in their wording, yet differing slightly. Observe also that just below, in vs. 49, occurs one of the plainest examples of Lk.'s mistranslation; see Exhibit VI, E.

In the letter referred to in the note on Exhibit XV, A, Professor Burkitt accepted the emendation here proposed, saying: "And also [I agree] about *διχοτομήσει*, which indeed I had also thought of."

Exhibit XXV, C (Jn. 7:3). The absurd reading of our Greek text hardly needs comment; notice however that the next verse bids Jesus show his wonders *to the world* (not simply to a band of obscure and over-credulous Galileans)!

The reason of the mistake made by the translator (or copyist?) is as obvious as any error of translating can be: the subject of the verb, "that *they* may see," is the indefinite plural which is omnipresent in Aramaic; while its direct object, "your disciples," immediately following, holds the place ordinarily occupied by the subject. Any rapidly working scribe or translator of the Aramaic text would therefore have been likely to omit or overlook the following *waw*. Another of the many unquestionable proofs of a translated Fourth Gospel.

Chapter XI

LOST PORTIONS OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT

THE cases thus far observed of such accidental loss have already received mention in the introductory portion of Chapter VIII. The attempt to restore in these passages the text originally written by the evangelists was reserved for this chapter.

The loss of a single (but highly important) Aram. word was shown in Exhibit XXI, C. In this case the omission was not due to accident, but to the mistake of a scribe, who believed himself to be correcting the carelessness of his predecessor.

In Mt. 5:32 two words were accidentally dropped from the original text in the process of transmission, see Exhibit III, B. The passage read: "Any one who divorces his wife on any other ground than that of FORNICATION, [AND MARRIES ANOTHER] (*וְנוּחָא וְנָסַב אֲחֵרָנָהּ*), commits adultery with her." That which brought about the omission was the resemblance of the one group of overlined letters to the other.

Oversights of this nature are of course likely to occur, sometimes leaving very extensive gaps, in the manuscript transmission of texts in any language, but they are especially frequent in unpointed Semitic, as would be expected. Examples in the O.T. are very many, and the demonstration is usually made easy by the Grk. translation, or a parallel passage, or both. A typical case, which may help to illus-

trate the similar examples in the N.T., is the lacuna in the Massoretic text of Esther 3:7b, which reads as follows:

הפיל פור הוא הגורל לפני המן מיום ליום ומחדש לחדש ולאבד ביום אחד עם מרדכי ויפל הגורל בשלושה עשר לחדש שנים: עשר הוא חדש אדר: "They cast *pūr*, that is, the lot, before Haman, for one day after another and for month after month, [to destroy in one day the people of Mordecai; and the lot fell on day 13 of month] 12, which is the month Adar."

Here, our Heb. has lost ten words necessary to the sense; preserved in the Grk. translation, and in part in vs. 13. The copyist's eye caught the wrong group of letters; the more easily, because of the tall *lamed* at the beginning.

In Theodotion's Heb. of Neh. 8:7, eleven words dropped out because of the similarity between *יֵמִין* and *מִבְּיָנִים*; in 1 Chron. 28:20, thirteen words, because "house of the Lord" occurred twice; in some Mss. of Josh. 21:36 f., twenty words, for a similar reason; in Judg. 16:13 f., seventeen words (preserved only in the Grk. versions), because of the repetition of a single word of four letters. There are other equally striking instances.

The only example of considerable loss of the original Aram. text in the Gospels is the passage Mt. 14:12 f., which is curiously like, and yet unlike, the parallels in Mk. and Lk., and has caused much discussion without receiving any acceptable solution. The considerably longer text of Mk. is in its wording so closely parallel to Mt. that it may reasonably be expected to give some help. When it is turned word by word into Aram., the reason for the peculiar text of Mt. appears, it seems to me, with certainty. It is a case exactly like those which have just been mentioned. The two parallel texts, in the Aram., were the following:

Mk. 6:29-32	Mt. 14:12 f.
ושמעו תלמידוהי ואחו	ואחו תלמידוהי
ושקלו גשמה ושמוהי בקר	ושקלו גשמה וקברוהי
ואתכנשו תלמידיא לישוע	ואחו תלמידיא
ואמרו להכל	והודעו לה כל []
די עבדו ודי הודעו	
ואמר להון אתו לכון	
בלחודכון למדבר ונוחו זעיר	
ארי שגאין די אתין ואולין	
הו ולא הוא להון	
זמן אף לא למכל	
ואולו בספינא	ואולו בספינא
למדבר בלחודהון	למדבר בלחודהון

The ease with which the accidental omission could take place is very evident, for the two groups of letters overlined are not only practically identical, but are also conspicuous on the page, with the tall *lamed* at either end of the group. This shows exactly what fell out from the text of Mt., and why. Moreover, every word of Mt.'s Grk. is now accounted for. The translator had his difficulty here, for a merely literal rendering of the mutilated Aram. text could not possibly serve; there must be some editing, as the following shows.

Rendering of the mutilated text: *καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦραν τὸ πτώμα καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτόν. καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα [] καὶ ἀνεχώρησαν ἐκείθεν ἐν πολλῷ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν.*

The reason for each step in the slight editing of this text in order to produce the Grk. of our Mt. is evident. The translator of Mk. departed from a strictly literal rendering

at only one point. The second occurrence of "the disciples"—now those of Jesus, not of John—might cause confusion; he accordingly wrote "the apostles."

The remaining case of omission of this nature is the small but important gap in Mk. 9:13, which fortunately can be filled from the parallel in Mt. The readings, Greek and Aramaic, are the following:

Mt. 17:12

λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν
ὅτι Ἡλείας ἤδη ἦλθεν,
καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν
ἀλλὰ ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ
ὅσα ἠθέλησαν·
οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
ἄνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν
ὑπ' αὐτῶν.

Mk. 9:13

ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν
ὅτι καὶ Ἡλείας ἐλήλυθεν,
καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ
ὅσα ἠθέλον,

καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν.

אמר אנא לכו	אמר אנא לכו
די אליא כדו אחא	די אליא אחא
ולא ידעוהי אלא	
ועבדו בה כל די	ועבדו לה כל די
צבין הוּ	צבין הוּ I I
וכן אף בר אנשא	
עתיד למחש בידהוּ	
וכדי כתיב עלוהי	כדי כתיב עלוהי

In this case, the two groups of letters which are here overlaid resembled each other in the ordinary script, with no space between words, more closely than appears in any modern printed text. The words "as is written concerning him" must have stood in the *original* text at the end of the passage.

GENERAL INDEX

- Abba*, the term reserved for the heavenly Father, 75, 79
 Abraham as the "Servant," xxx
Acta Mart. et Sanct., ed. Bedjan, 13, 25
 I Acts (1:1—15:35), xix, xxix, xxxix, xl, lv, 82, 121
 Akiba, Rabbi, xxii, xl
 Allen, Willoughby, 26, 96
 Antioch, Palestinian Christians at, 65 ff., 70
 Aquila, lix, 43, 78, 153
 Aramaic literature, disappearance of, xi
 Aramaic of Palestine, the, lix, 14, 15, 24 f., 26, 46, 47, 53, 58, 64 ff., 83, 86 ff., 132
 Atonement, vicarious, taught in Is. 50 and 53, xxiii
 Bar Cocheba, xxii
 Bauer, Walter, 30, 40, 41 f., 112, 149
Beginnings of Christianity, The, xvi, xxi, xxii, xxxix, xli
 Bel and Nebo, xxxvi
 Bernard, 42
 Bezae codex, text of, 4, 78, 79, 117, 134
 Blass, 96
 Brockelmann, *Vergl. Gramm.*, 64
 Burkitt, F. C., 65 ff., 86, 158
 Burney, C. F., 3, 110, 148, 153
 Canon of Hebrew scripture, the "Writings," xxxix f.
 Case, S. J., editor, xviii
 Charles, R. H., xxvi
 Conflation in the Semitic text, 125-128
 Creed, I. M., 29
 Crucifixion, date of the, 6, 24, 47 f.
 Cyrus, interpolated in Isaiah, xxxii
 "Daily" bread, liii
 Dalman, Gustaf, 26, 54, 89
 David, the house of, xv, xviii, xx ff., xxiv f., xxviii ff., xlv, 148
 Decapolis, the, 87
 Delitzsch, Friedrich, 142
 Dispersion, Jews of the, xxxvii, li, 46
 Dodd, C. H., 145
 Easton, B. S., 29, 32, 100
 Eschatology of the Gospels, xxxvii
 Form criticism, xlv
 Fourth Gospel, atmosphere of the, xlii, 140; its author, 52 f.; late date of translation into Greek, 121
 Fraenkel, Siegmund, 103
 Gamaliel II, xl
 Gentiles, the, in the Messianic program, xxv ff.
 Gospel according to the Hebrews, 4
 Gray, Buchanan, xvi, xvii
 Harran, xxx
 Hasmoneans, the, xxi
 Hebrew O. T. idioms employed in the earliest Christian writings (Aram. or Heb.), 68 f.; these idioms avoided by the Jews, 69, 74
 Heitmüller, 112
 Herford, R. Travis, xli
 Hill, G. F., on coins of Palestine, 7
 Jackson, Foakes, xvi
 Jacob as the "Servant," xxx
 Jerome, St., 15, 33, 119, 154
 Johanan ben Zakkai, xl
 John, 21st chapter of, vii, liii, liv
 John the Baptist, xxii, xli, xlv, 57, 106, 111, 137, 146
 Josephus, liv, 95
 Joshua the Stylite, Chronicle of, 25
 Judean dialect of Aramaic, 80, 89 f.
 "King," in the Psalter, xxv

Klostermann-Gressmann, the commentaries of, 14, 26, 29, 55, 58, 74, 96, 100, 118, 123, 130
 Kohut, George A., Jewish Studies in Memory of, xxiii, xli

Lachish, Hebrew ostraca of, 91
 Lagrange, M. J., 15, 58, 80, 100, 130, 135, 144
 Lake, Kirsopp, xvi
 Lietzmann, 104
 Littmann, Enno, 17, 95, 96, 97, 101, 104, 146
Logos, of the Fourth Gospel, xxi
 Lord, title of the Messiah, xix, xxiv
 Lord's Prayer, the, liii, 15, 77

Messenger of the Covenant, the title, xix, xxxiii, xlv
 Messiah, the, a divine being, xvi-xx, xxii, xlv, 146, 147, 153; preëxistent, xix-xxi; his incarnation taught by the prophets, xx f.; a conqueror, xxii; subordinate to the Father, xliii; will punish Jews and Gentiles alike, xxvii; to remain in Palestine, 47; to reign forever, xvii f., xx f., xxxviii; entitled "Elect One," xxviii; "Just One," xxix; origin of title, "the Messiah," xxxi, xxxiii
 Messiah, the, son of Ephraim, xxxiv
 Messianic Psalms, xxv, 22
 Montefiore, 18
 Moore, G. F., xxxix, lv, 26

Nabatean inscriptions, 74
 Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, 54, 88, 90
 Numerals indicated by Semitic letters, 6 f., 24

Omissions from Aram. text, accidental, 122 f.
 Oral transmission of written material, xlvii, l, 127 f.

Palmyrene inscriptions, 74
 Paul, the apostle, xi, xxvi, xxix, xxxviii, xlii

Perles, F., 142
 Plummer, 34, 55, 59, 144
 Porphyry, 137
 Psalms of Solomon, xvii f., xxi, xxii, xxiii
 Psalter, date of Greek translation, xxv

Ryle and James, editors of Ps. Sol., xviii, xix, xxi

Sadducees, xxxix
 Schulthess, *Gramm.*, 66
 Schwartz, E., 112
 Second Isaiah, date of, xxxi
 Servant, the, in Isaiah, xvii, xxiii, xxviii, xli, xlviii; the index of the nation, xxix ff., xxxiv
 von Soden, 58
 Son of God, the title, xvi, xx, xxiii, xxviii, xxxviii, 117, 143, 147
 Son of Man, the title, xix, xx, 44, 46, 56, 117, 119, 143, 147 f.
 Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, 48
 Streeter, B. H., liii, lv, 145
 Swete, H. B., 58, 94, 130, 144
 "Synoptic Problem," liii
 Syriac versions: The Curetonian, 65 ff., 71, 118; the Palestinian, 66 ff., 73, 79; the Peshitta, 1, 65 ff., 78, 79, 80, 132, 141, 157; the Sinaitic, 4, 12, 64 ff., 71, 74, 78, 79, 94, 107, 117

Thackeray, H. St. John, lvi
 Tosephta, *Sabbath* and *Yadaim*, xl
 Transposition in the Aram. text, 123 f.

Ur of the Chaldees, xxx

Weizsäcker, 40
 Wellhausen, J., xlvii, liv f., lvi, lvii, lviii, lix, 9, 10, 14, 17, 22 f., 26, 57, 74, 77, 79, 96, 100, 102 f., 112, 117, 125, 130, 132, 145
 Whiston, liv f.

Zachariah ben Jehoiada, liv
 Zahn, Th., 30, 40, 42, 51, 72, 107, 119, 146, 147

INDEX OF PASSAGES

I. THE NEW TESTAMENT		Matthew	
Matthew	18:23 ff.	3, 69	
2:4 ff.	xxxviii	19:4	12
2:23	151, 152, 153 f.	19:9	18 f.
3:16	71	19:17	16, 20
4:6	4	20:1	69
5:13	13	20:23	xliii
5:32	x, 16, 18 f., 122	20:27	97
5:48	92, 93, 96	21:9	20 f.
6:1	102	21:32	57
6:6	16, 19 f., 33	21:33	69
6:11	liii	21:43	20, 22
6:18	16, 19 f., 33	22:2	69
6:23	33	23:9	76, 79
8:6	3	23:25 f.	101 ff.
8:9	3, 94, 96 f.	23:29-31	103
8:14	3	23:35 f.	liv
8:28	88	23:37	106
9:2	3	23:38	20, 22 f.
10:2	94, 97 f.	24:1 f.	134
10:17 f.	39	24:14	xxvi
10:25	87	24:51	155, 157 f.
10:34 ff.	114	26:6	93, 96
11:5	xxviii	26:24	133
11:12 f.	104, 106	26:41	12, 14 ff.
11:16 f.	106	26:63	xxxviii
12:9-14	7	26:70	16 ff., 20
12:39	128	26:73	37
13:4	7	27:1	24
13:13	8, 126	27:32	li, 129, 131 f.
13:14 f.	11	27:62	21, 23 ff.
13:23	10 f.	27:64	24
13:28	69	28:1	21, 25 f., 38
13:54, 58	99	28:13	24
14:2	98, 99	28:17	26 ff.
14:12 f.	123, 160 ff.	28:19	xxvi
14:13	89	Mark	
16:2-4	128	1:27	12, 79
16:26	31, 76	3:5	7 f., 42
17:11	56, 57 f.	3:15	130
17:12	106, 162	3:32	5, 28
17:15	3	4:4	7, 9
17:20	131	4:8	7, 9, 29, 44

INDEX OF PASSAGES

John		John	
7:27	62	16:5	50, 51 f.
7:28	61, 62	16:6-11	139
7:33 ff.	46	16:7	113
7:37 f.	93, 108, 109-111	16:16	51
8:14	62	16:17 ff.	52, 119
8:19	49, 62	16:21, 25	52
8:21 f.	133	16:27	50
8:25	55	16:30	50, 52
8:28	46	17:5	xx
8:56	139, 144, 148	17:6-8	49
8:58	xx	17:14	91, 109, 114
10:7 f.	x, 2, 108, 111-113	17:25 f.	49
10:11-18	112	18:24	120
10:16	xxvi	18:25	117, 119 f.
10:18	114	18:28	6, 24, 47
10:30, 33	147	19:14	6, 24, 47
11:1 f.	144, 148 f.	19:35	50, 52 f.
11:31	12	19:36	47
11:33	8, 39, 41-43, 76, 80	20:10	76, 80 f.
11:38	8, 39, 41-43	20:17	71, 72, 73
11:48	xix	21:7	4
11:49 f.	61, 63	Acts	
11:52	xlili	1:10	72
12:7	61, 62 f.	1:26	98
12:11	30, 39, 43 f.	2:9 ff.	36
12:20 ff.	xlvi	2:27	xliv
12:23-31	48	2:47	90
12:31-36	45	3:13	xxviii
12:34	xxxviii, 44-47	3:14	xxix
12:43	41	3:24	150
13:1 f.	44, 47 f.	3:26	xxviii
13:13	3	4:1 f.	xxxix
13:19	58	4:27, 30	xxviii
13:32	75, 77 f.	7:52	xxix
13:36	51	7:56	148
14:2	108, 113	10:42 f.	148
14:4-9	49	11:28	2, 46, 82, 85, 87
14:5	51	11:30	87
14:7 f.	45, 48 f., 50	12:10	134
14:17-19	49, 50 f.	13:35	xliv
14:22	117, 119	13:47	xxvi
14:25-31	139	23:6 ff.	xxxix
14:28 b.	49, 50	28:26 f.	11
14:31	133, 135, 138-140	Romans	
15:15	49	8:15	79
15:16	30, 40, 44	11:25 ff.	xxvi
15:27	49		

INDEX OF PASSAGES

Galatians		Joshua	
1:11 f.	xi	21:36 f.	160
1:16-19	xi	23:11	77
2:6	xi	Judges	
3:5	99	16:13 f.	160
4:6	79	20:7	78
2. THE OLD TESTAMENT		20:39	137
Genesis		1 Samuel	
2:18	87	13:1	x
3:1 (Jer. Targ.)	146	14:19	44
3:6	95	16:14	153
5:1	14	20:12	114
8:3	43	2 Samuel	
16:6	87	2:21	78
18:14	77	3:1	29, 44
22:12	5	6:3 f.	124
24:64	4	7:16	xv
26:13	43	13:26	113
31:8	66	17:10	116
34:29	150	19:1 (18:33)	9, 43
45:26	27	1 Kings	
Exodus		2:23	78
15:14 ff.	42	2 Kings	
21:18	137	5:17	113
22:8	137	9:33	150
40:37	66	11:1	150
Leviticus		1 Chronicles	
1:13	111	16:34, 41	xxv
2:13	13	28:20	160
3:3	111	2 Chronicles	
20:10	19	5:13	xxv
Numbers		7:6	xxv
28:17 f.	47	24:25	151
Deuteronomy		25:8	55
1:7, 13	78	35:19 f.	x
2:13	78	Ezra	
4:15	77	2:62	150
5:30 (27)	78	3:11	xxv
8:13	137	4:15	111
24:1-5	95	4:15, 19	xix
28:63	108	Nehemiah	
31:29	141	8:7	160
Joshua		Psalms	
2:4	152	2:6-8	xxiv
4:1	72	2:7	xx
4:6 f., 21 f.	73	6:8	8
18:4	78	16:10	xliv
		19:6	108

INDEX OF PASSAGES

1 Maccabees		Enoch	
2:57	xxii	90:30	xxvii
6:8	152	105:2	xxiii
Wisdom		Psalms of Solomon	
17:3	153	17:4	xxvii
Enoch		17:26	xxiv, xxvii
chaps. 46-70	xix	17:36	29
ch. 46	xxiii	17:35-38	xxvii
48:2-6	xx, xxvii	17:39	xviii, xxiii
48:4	xxvi	17:47	xxvii
48:8 f.	xxiii	18:6	xix, xx
50:2-4	xxvii	Testaments (Levi, Judah, Zebulun,	
52:6-9	xxiii	Dan, Asher)	xxvii
52:62	xxiii	Sibylline Oracles	
69:27	xxiii, 147	III, 710-723, 767 f.	xxvii

